ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Roll Call

2. Announcements by the Chancellor

3. Announcements by the Chair and Others

4. Special Orders – Consent Calendar

   Approval of the minutes of the June 6, 2019 meeting (Attachment 1)

In Memoriam

John Mohr, Sociology, (1956-2019)
Wade Clark Roof, Religion, (1939-2019)
Vincent Jaccarino, Physics, (1924-2019)
Geoff Rutkowski, Music, (1942-2019)
Paul Henry Barrett, Physics, (1922-2019)
Robert Schrieffer, Institute for Theoretical Physics, (1931-2019)
Ian B. Rhodes, Electrical and Computer Engineering, (1941-2019)
Edward R. Branigan, Film and Media Studies, (1945-2019)
Alan Konheim, Computer Science, (1934-2019)
Patrick McCarthy, English, (1922-2019)
John Whealdon Cotton, Psychological and Brain Sciences, (1925-2019)
Dolores Menstell Hsu, Music, (1930-2019)
Wallace Chafe, Linguistics, (1929-2019)
Thomas Bruice, Chemistry and Biochemistry, (1925-2019)
Keith Kedward, Mechanical Engineering, (1939-2019)
Herbert Fingarette, Philosophy, (1921-2018)
Carl B. Zytowski, Music, (1921-2018)
Ursula Mahlendorf, Germanic and Slavic Studies, (1929-2018)
Giorgio Perissinotto, Spanish and Portuguese, (1942-2018)
Clifford Bunton, Chemistry, (1920-2018)
Harold C. Kirker, History, (1921-2018)
Harris Carl, History, (1937-2018)
Daphne Bugental, Psychological and Brain Sciences, (1928-2018)

2018-19 Annual Reports (Attachment 2)

Bren School of Environmental Science & Management Faculty Executive Committee
Charges Officer and Charges Advisory Committee
College of Creative Studies Faculty Executive Committee
College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee
College of Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee
Committee on Academic Personnel
Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools
Committee on Committees
Committee on Diversity and Equity
Committee on International Education
Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections
Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards
Council on Planning and Budget
Council on Research and Instructional Resources
Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Faculty Executive Committee
Graduate Council

5. Reports of Special Committees
6. Reports of Standing Committees
7. Petitions of Students – None
8. Unfinished Business
9. University and Faculty Welfare
10. New Business
    Discussion Item: Selection Criteria for the President of the University
    (Attachment 3)

Attachment 1
Minutes of the June 6, 2019 Faculty Legislature Meeting

Academic Senate
Santa Barbara Division

FACULTY LEGISLATURE MINUTES
June 6, 2019

The Faculty Legislature of the Santa Barbara Division met in Library Conference Room 1575 at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 6, 2019, with Chair Henning Bohn presiding. The meeting was attended by 21 voting members and 2 ex officios, and other interested parties.

Announcements by the Chancellor (from the slides presented)

As Chancellor Yang was unable to attend the meeting, Chair Bohn presented his slides.

Thank you to Senate Chair Henning Bohn and to all of our faculty colleagues for your commitment to shared governance, and for another beautiful academic year together!

Transitions

UC Police Department
Interim Chief of Police James Brock joined our police department in April from UC San Francisco. We are conducting a national search for our next Chief of Police. We are forming an independent police
Student Updates

Fall 2019 Preliminary SIR Data

- 93,447 first-year applicants (92,314 last year)
- 29% admission rate (32% last year)
- 5,386 total SIRs (3,732 CA residents; 1,654 non-residents)
  - Note: Expected Fall 2019 enrollment is 3,475 CA residents and 1,492 non-residents after the summer – 4,967 total first-year students
- Average GPA: 4.18 (up from 4.13 last year)
- Average SAT: 1359 (up from 1346 last year)
- 27% underrepresented minorities
- 38% first-generation four-year college students
- 69% California residents

Nonresident Tuition

Last month, UC Regents voted to approve a 2.6% tuition increase for nonresident students, with an amendment to set aside some of the funds for financial aid.

New Classroom Building Project

Last month, UC Regents gave final approval for our new classroom building, with 23 classrooms and 5 lecture halls providing 2,000 new general assignment seats. This will be our first new building dedicated to classrooms since 1967 (Buchanan Hall).

2019 Commencement

Sunday, June 9
11:00 AM | Campbell Hall
College of Creative Studies

Saturday, June 15
9:00 AM | Commencement Green
College of Letters & Science
Math, Life & Physical Sciences  I

1:00 PM | Commencement Green
College of Letters & Science
Math, Life & Physical Sciences  II

4:00 PM | Commencement Green
College of Engineering

Friday, June 14
9:00 AM | Bren Hall Courtyard
Bren School of Environmental Science & Management

1:00 PM | Commencement Green
Graduate Division

Sunday, June 16
9:00 AM | Commencement Green
College of Letters & Science
Fundraising
We have raised $171.9 million in private gifts so far this year.

New Endowed Chairs for 2018-19

- Robert and Victoria Mehrabian
  - Support three existing endowed chairs at $1-million level, up from $500,000 level
  - Establish six Mehrabian Career Development Chairs in College of Engineering
  - Establish five Mehrabian Chancellor’s Chairs in College of Engineering
  - Establish Mehrabian Presidential Chair in Engineering

- John & Jody Arnhold Director of Performance (Theater and Dance)

Research Funding
Total funding awarded to sponsored projects in FY 2018 is $209.3 million.

National Academy of Sciences
Professor of Physics Cristina Marchetti and Yzurdiaga Professor of Theoretical Physics Leon Balents

Royal Society of Chemistry
Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry Alison Butler receives the Society’s Inorganic Mechanisms Award

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Dr. Tine Sloan of our Gevirtz Graduate School of Education is appointed by Governor Newsom to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and unanimously elected by the commissioners as chair.

United States Artists Fellowship
Professor of Theater and Dance Frances Ya-Chu Cowhig is awarded a prestigious United States Artists Fellowship – given to the most compelling artists in the country.

NSF Early Career Award
Assistant Professors of Electrical and Computer Engineering Mahnoosh Alizadeh, left, and Zheng Zhang.

DARPA Award
Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering Enoch Yeung is awarded $1.4 million from DARPA Biological Technologies Office for his research.

2019-20 Governor’s May Budget Revise

Governor’s May Revise
- 7% increase of $243.5 million in ongoing State General Fund
  (up $3.5 million from January budget proposal)
$3.5 million for rapid rehousing of homeless students

$181.5 million in one-time funding (up $28.5 million from January budget proposal)

$138 million for deferred maintenance

$25 million for UC Retirement Program

$15 million to support expanded degree completion and certification programs at UC extension centers

$3.5 million for a UCSF Dyslexia Center pilot program

"These investments are provided with the expectation that tuition will remain flat, access will be increased, and time to degree will improve"

State Funding for UC

We appreciate the Governor’s commitment to UC

However, UC's additional budget request is $183 million, including:

- $95 million for ongoing investment to maintain instruction and programmatic support
- $71 million for undergraduate and graduate enrollment growth,
- and to support faculty and staff
- $17 million for debt service for capital outlays
- We are working hard to convince the Legislature of the importance of increased investment in UC's ongoing programmatic needs

Budget negotiations continue, with June 15 as the constitutional deadline for the Legislature to pass a state budget

Isla Vista Update

Isla Vista Remembrance Events
Our faculty, students, staff, and the local community planned several special events to commemorate last month’s five-year anniversary of the Isla Vista tragedy.

Isla Vista Common Table: Beloved Community
Saturday, May 18, in People’s Park, hosted by Associated Students and our Lois & Walter Capps Project

Isla Vista Memorial Project Online Exhibition
Thanks to our Library staff and our students for creating this online space for reflection and healing

"We Remember" Walk and Vigil
Associated Students hosted the "We Remember" Walk and Vigil on May 23, starting at Storke Plaza and ending at Anisq'Oyo' Park

Announcements by the Chair

- The Committee on Committees has appointed a new Divisional Vice-Chair for 2019-20, Professor Jianwen Su of the Department of Computer Science.
- UC Regent and former Assembly Speaker John Perez was recently elected incoming Chair of the Regents.
- The Regents approved a 2.6% tuition increase for non-resident students.
- Chief Financial Officer of UC, Nathan Brostrom, has been appointed as Interim Chancellor of UC Merced.
- Academic Council approved BOARS' recommendations for the UC Transfer Guarantee. Our local Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools (CAERS) was dissatisfied with the BOARS recommendations, and Chair Bohn abstained from voting. It is unclear what the guarantee offers in addition to local Transfer Admission Guarantee agreements.
- Academic Council approved the proposed changes to Senate Regulation 636, which were submitted by our local Undergraduate Council. The proposed changes will allow campuses to
make exceptions to the regulation in cases where students have earned transferable credit while on approved leave of absence.

- Academic Council continued its discussion of Composite Benefit Rates (CBR). The University Committee on Research Policy and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare wrote a letter to President Napolitano, calling for mitigation measures to address increased CBR rates funded by research grants. Chair Bohn suggested that it would be beneficial to seek a permanent solution.
- Academic Council has approved a statement denouncing the recent restrictions on fetal stem cell research.
- The Governor’s May Revise falls short of the UC’s requested funding for 2019-20.
- The proposed affiliation agreement between UC San Francisco (UCSF) and Dignity Health has been withdrawn.
- UCI proposed a fully online business degree program for transfer students. The plan was deemed a new academic program which required review by the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP). UCEP ultimately rejected the proposal.
- In February, UCSF voted to approve a memorial on the divestment from fossil fuels in UC endowment funds. All other campuses followed, with the exception of UC Irvine. Irvine’s vote followed a long discussion about the desire to divest from fossil fuels in all funds, not solely general endowment funds, and whether it was appropriate to impose restrictions on future faculty. Following the requisite approvals, the memorial was moved to a mail ballot of all Academic Senate members. At UCSB, voting will begin on Monday and will go on for a two week period. Chair Bohn noted that the process is very scripted. The Regents ultimately make the decision as to how to proceed.

Consent Calendar

Motion: To approve the minutes of the April 18, 2019 meeting. *The motion was seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote.*

Proposal to change the name of the BA in History of Public Policy to BA in History of Public Policy and Law

Trevor Hayton, Chair of the Undergraduate Council, presented the Department of History’s proposal to change the name of the BA in *History of Public Policy* to the BA in *History of Public Policy and Law*. Per the proposal “the proposed change in the name of the major... reflects more fully the content of the courses and options in the major, the research and teaching of the faculty, and interest, experience, and purposes of students in the major, while making that equal emphasis more apparent to interested students.”

The proposal received final administrative endorsement from the Chancellor on May 17. The proposal was approved by the Undergraduate Council at its meeting of April 18. Prior to action by the Undergraduate Council, the proposal was distributed to the Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee, Associate Vice Chancellor Stopple, and Dean Majewski, all of whom supported the proposed change.

Motion: To approve the proposed name change of the BA in History of Public Policy to BA in History of Public Policy and Law. *The motion was seconded and passed with a unanimous show of hands.*

Proposal to change the name of the BA and BS in Statistical Science to the BA and BS in Statistics and Data Science
Chair Hayton introduced the Department of Statistics and Applied Probability’s proposal to change the name of the BA and BS and Statistical Science to the BA and BS in Statistics and Data Science. Per the proposal, “the department would like to modernize the program’s name to reflect recent changes in the field of statistics and data science.”

The proposal received final administrative endorsement from the Chancellor on May 14. The proposal was approved by the Undergraduate Council at its meeting of April 4. Prior to action by the Undergraduate Council, the proposal was distributed to the Graduate Council, the faculty executive committees of Letters and Science, Engineering, and the Bren School Executive Committee, the Department of Computer Science, Associate Vice Chancellor Stopple, and Dean Wiltzius.

In the discussion, members voiced concerns that the term ‘Data Science’ might interfere with planning for other programs related to the field, that the UCSB Data Science Initiative should have been formally consulted, and that coordination with the Data Science Initiative would be desirable going forward.

UgC Chair Hayton noted that the use of Data Science in this major name would not preclude other programs from creating similar names.

**Motion:** To approve the proposed name change of the BA and BS in Statistical Science to the BA and BS in Data Science. *The motion was seconded and passed with 14 in favor, 3 against, and 6 abstentions.*

Proposal to change the name of the B.A. in Slavic Languages and Literatures to Russian and East European Studies

Chair Hayton presented the proposal from the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies to change the name of the B.A. degree in Slavic Languages and Literatures to Russian and East European Studies. The proposed name is consistent with the Department’s curricular offerings, and is, per the proposal “much more reflective of our program’s interdisciplinary approach.”

The proposal received final administrative endorsement from the Chancellor on May 17. The proposal was approved by the Undergraduate Council at its meeting of April 18. Prior to action by the Undergraduate Council, the proposal was distributed to the Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee, Associate Vice Chancellor Stopple, and Dean Majewski.

**Motion:** To approve the proposed name change of the BA in Slavic Languages and Literatures to the BA in Russian and East European Studies. *The motion was seconded and passed with a unanimous show of hands.*

Proposal for Changes to Santa Barbara Regulation 235

The Undergraduate Council received a request last spring from Associate Vice Chancellor Stopple to clarify Senate Regulation 235 on Quarterly Honors. In response to the Dean’s request, the Council proposed several changes to the language in Regulation 235 which are designed to allow students who have received an Incomplete or “I” grade to remain eligible for Quarterly Honors.
The proposed language was distributed to the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections, the Letters and Science Executive Committee, the Engineering Executive Committee, and the Creative Studies Executive Committee.

Members briefly discussed the need for Incomplete grades due to medical emergencies and logistical issues, as well as the process for awarding Quarterly Honors when a student has received an Incomplete grade.

**Motion:** To approve the proposed changes to Senate Regulation 235. *The motion was seconded and passed with 22 in favor, 0 against, and 1 abstention.*

Chair Bohn thanked the Legislature members for their service, and wished all a productive finals week and summer. The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 p.m.
COLLEGE OF CREATIVE STUDIES FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT, 2018-2019

CHARGE OF THE COMMITTEE

To govern the College of Creative Studies in accordance with the provisions of Divisional Bylaw 40A. (Am 25 Oct 01; 27 May 04; 09 Mar 17) specifically:

1. To represent faculty in all aspects of the curriculum of the College.
2. To authorize the Dean, at the committee's discretion, to enforce all regulations concerning students, including the regulations governing transfer and academic disqualification.
3. To advise and assist the Dean in the administration of the College.
4. To appoint all committees of the Faculty not otherwise provided for.

SUMMARY

The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) of the College of Creative Studies (CCS) met 8 times during the academic year 2018-19 and addressed many issues. Prominent among these were:

- Discussion of changes to the LSOE series and its impacts on CCS and faculty.
- Appointment of two ad-hoc committees, one examining faculty workload and one continuing a review of the CCS general education requirements.
- Responses to multiple external queries.

ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

CCS application review
The Committee initiated a review of CCS application procedures.

CCS Community /Inclusivity statement
In response to a suggestion that the College have a prominent statement about the importance of inclusivity the Committee underwent discussion on how best to balance academic freedom and also foster an inclusive environment. A statement was drafted.

Personnel review committees
Discussion took place on the necessity for the committee to be anonymous and also whether it would be preferable to have CCS LSOE’s serve as the chair.

Instructional Workload discussion
An ad-hoc committee was formed to examine the issue of faculty workload.

CCS FEC Commendation of Excellence award
Following extensive discussion, it was agreed that there would be no award this year (on a trial basis) but that the time usually devoted to this at graduation would be spent enumerating the class achievements.
Revised prompt on CCS written evaluations
In response to a faculty suggestion some changes to the prompts used in the CCS course evaluation form were discussed.

RESPONSE TO OUTSIDE REQUESTS

Presidential policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment.
Members were broadly in support of the proposed policy but found the policy overall to be difficult to read and interpret. It was suggested that, perhaps in the FAQ, some simpler versions could be presented.

OA2020 (an international open access agreement)
Faculty are in strong support of open access and, if the Committee on Library, Information and Instructional resources feels that OA2020 is the best way to achieve this goal then they would support this initiative.

EEMB Data Notebook and MCDB Data Notebook for PRP review
The FEC provided feedback on the data notebooks for EEMB and MCDB and then responded to the subsequent ERC and PRP committee reports and the department response.

Proposed revision of Senate Resolution 125 H3
After discussion of these potential impacts the Committee strongly endorsed the proposal. Any effects on CCS students are likely to be minimal and the change is only likely to benefit students.

Supercourse Challenges and Recommendations
The committee generally supported efforts to regularize the system and were in favor of departments having a more formal process to allow for exceptions that could be quicker and require less information than a full Master Course Approval.

Request by OISS to use registration blocks to comply with the U.S. Federal Registrar and Homeland Security
The Committee supported the proposal and was appreciative of the work done by OISS in ensuring that the International Students at UCSB remain in compliance even as these numbers have grown significantly.

Renaming proposal, Judicial Affairs
The FEC agreed that the change of the name to Office of Student Conduct was appropriate.

Action on Senate regulation 636E on the Writing requirement
The FEC was supportive, but noted that the later, unnecessarily restrictive, addition of “for a non-academic reason” may require this to be brought back yet one more time.

Action on Student Code of Conduct
The committee was supportive of the proposed changes.
Request for comments or questions on the Library Organizational Changes
The FEC discussed the underlying issues and appreciated the more detailed context provided by the document. There was still concern about the loss of expertise in specific areas and the FEC felt that sufficient time should be allowed for full discussion of this issue with those that would be most impacted.

OTHER ITEMS OF NOTE

- A retreat for all faculty of the College of Creative Studies was held on 25th September 2018.
- The second annual CCS Research and Creative Activities Conference was held on Saturday, Nov 3rd, 2018.
- Three searches were carried out – for LSOE’s in Art, Music Composition and Marine Science.
- A new Communications and Development Associate was hired.
- Two Student Service Awards were made.
- Two CCS students received Goldwater Scholarships and two current students were awarded NSF GRFP scholarships.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

John G. Latto, Chair, Senior Lecturer SOE, Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology, College of Creative Studies
Sathya Guruswamy, Lecturer SOE, Physics, College of Creative Studies
Kara M. Brown, Lecturer potential SOE, College of Creative Studies, Writing Program
Karel Kasteels, Lecturer potential SOE, Mathematics, College of Creative Studies,
Phill Conrad, Senior Lecturer SOE, Computer Science, College of Creative Studies (until 1/15/19)
Richert K. Wang, Lecturer potential SOE, Computer Science, College of Creative Studies (after 1/15/19)
Jeremy J. Haladyna, Senior Lecturer SOE, College of Creative Studies
Leroy E. Laverman, Senior Lecturer SOE, Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Creative Studies
Jane L. Mulfinger, Professor, Art
Raisa E. Feldman, At-Large Member, Associate Professor, Statistics and Applied Probability
Madeleine I. Sorapure, At-Large Member, Program Director, Writing Program
Claudia M. Tyler, Non-Senate Academic Rep
Bruce Tiffney, Ex Officio, Interim Dean CCS, Professor, Earth Sciences
Sara C. Sterphone, Consultant, CCS Student Affairs Officer
Lynn Clark, Advisor
Jennifer R. Johansen, Advisor
Executive Summary

The charge of the College of Letters and Science FEC is defined in Part III, Appendix II, D1.93A of the Santa Barbara Division’s Bylaws and Regulations as a committee of the Academic Senate through which the Faculty of the College can coordinate the academic affairs of the College. At UCSB, the College of Letters and Science comprises more than 90% of the undergraduate population on campus, nearly 80% of its faculty, 80% of its departments, and 90% of the degree programs. Because the College of Letters and Science hosts nearly 80 undergraduate majors with another 40 emphases and well over 40 minors, the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) focuses significant attention on undergraduate issues.

The FEC, comprised of two elected faculty members from each division, met 15 times during the academic year, typically five meetings per quarter, for two hours each. The committee also includes, as non-voting members, a Graduate Student Association (GSA) member and an Associated Students (A.S.) member, along with the L&S Dean of Undergraduate Education and the Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Science.

Policy/Regulation/Guideline Review

With a variety of other committees, the FEC is offered the opportunity to review and provide perspective on system-wide and campus policy revisions. The committee frequently engages these opportunities to comment, as the policies and regulations nearly always impact the FEC area of focus, namely the well-being of departments, faculty, and students in L&S. Among the system-wide policy proposals and reports the FEC reviewed in 2018-19 were: presidential policy on sexual violence and harassment; second round review of open access policy for theses and dissertations; BOARS proposal for implementation of UC-Community College transfer guarantee; Regulation 636.E (UC Entry Level Writing Requirement); and the UC Sacramento Report. The FEC also considered the following campus policy revisions and initiatives: large-scale open access to scholarly publications; Office of International Students and Scholars proposal regarding compliance with federal immigration reporting requirements; student conduct degree clearance procedures; and a proposed unit name change from Office of Judicial Affairs to the Office of Student Conduct.

Academic Review Reports

Maintaining excellence in College departments, undergraduate programs, and graduate education is essential for the continued excellence of the University. As such, the FEC takes its role in Academic Program Reviews very seriously. This year the committee provided extensive comment during the reviews of the Writing Program, the Media Arts and Technology Program, the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology, and the Department of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology.
Curriculum Adjustments

Due to volume and significance, curriculum adjustments occupy a considerable amount of the FEC’s attention every year. Departments and programs are encouraged to actively monitor their academic programs, and disciplinary trends are balanced against program learning assessment data, enrollment pressures, faculty expertise, and available resources. From the FEC’s perspective, curriculum adjustments and proposals for new programs must have an academic rationale that places it within the broader context of the College. This perspective allows the committee’s review to safeguard against changes that negatively impact other departments or impose undue barriers to enrollment. The FEC has review authority over the modification of all undergraduate programs (majors and minors) in the College. Due to the sheer volume of changes that occur on an annual basis, modifications are divided into two categories—technical (typos, course title adjustments, etc.) and more substantive. Technical revisions are reviewed by divisional subcommittees (three) made up of the FEC faculty members representing a certain division (MLPS, HFA, SS), divisional Dean (or designee) and College advisor. Substantive changes and those identified by the three subcommittees undergo full review by the entire FEC. The FEC review is then forwarded to the Undergraduate Council for final approval to ensure equitable application of policies across the three colleges offering UG degrees (CCS, Engineering, and L&S). During 2018-19, the L&S FEC reviewed 26 substantive curriculum changes (to major and minor programs), including one new Pre-Major, and one new Emphasis. FEC subcommittees endorsed technical adjustments to 74 major and minor sheets, bearing in mind that the same adjustment could appear on multiple major or minor sheets, including emphases.

The FEC also reviews proposals for online courses. Unlike face-to-face courses, online courses go through significant scrutiny of the syllabus, format, assignments, and security procedures. Some of this additional scrutiny is required due to the unique manner in which student evaluation is performed and to consider student-instructor engagement. During 2018-19, the FEC reviewed and ultimately endorsed three online courses and one hybrid (face-to-face and online) course.

The FEC also considered several other curriculum adjustments in 2018-19. These changes included reviewing twelve requests to revalue course units. Six proposals were endorsed and forwarded to CCGE and those remaining were returned to the appropriate departments. The committee also addressed requests from two separate departments to allow students to pursue a major and minor, or a double major, within the unit. The FEC endorsed three proposals for individual majors within L&S. Finally, the committee endorsed an interdisciplinary PhD emphasis in Climate Science and a revised proposal to establish a Master’s Degree in Environmental Data Science, housed in the Bren School (the FEC understands that this program is linked to a broader campus Data Science initiative which has not been officially rolled out yet).

Other Academic Issues Addressed

Having identified that **there exists no stated policy requiring UCSB courses to have a syllabus**, the FEC sent to the UG Council a proposal on how the campus could address this
critical issue. FEC urges that this matter be addressed expeditiously. Regarding transfer admissions, the FEC considered and endorsed a Mathematics Department proposal to CAERS (and a CAERS counterproposal) designed to strengthen admissions criteria for transfer students intending to major in Mathematics. The FEC also reviewed procedural recommendations for UCSB super-courses. Concerned about the anticipated impact on many L&S departments, the FEC engaged in discussions with the Senate Chair, the University Librarian, and the Executive Vice-Chancellor with respect to the proposed and emerging UCSB Library reorganization.

The FEC was also involved with the following adjustments to local academic policies and procedures, some of which carried over from the previous academic year: Revision of Divisional Senate Regulation SR 125.H.3 (calculating major GPA); changes to SB Regulation 235 (Dean’s Honors); and changes to Divisional Regulation 25 (grade appeal process).

Other Activities

The FEC oversees selection of the Harold J. Plous Memorial Award. The 2019-20 Plous recipient is Alenda Chang, Assistant Professor in the Department of Film and Media Studies. The committee also oversees several other awards within the College.

2018-19 FEC Committee Members
Ralph Armbruster Sandoval, Chicana and Chicano Studies (Chair)
Mahdi Abu-Omar, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Amit Ahuja, Political Science
Dorota Dutsch, Classics
Laurie Monahan, History of Art and Architecture
James Roney, Psychological and Brain Sciences

Ex officio members

Jeff Stopple, AVC and Dean of Undergraduate Education
Pierre Wiltzius, Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Science

Student Representatives

Matthew Fritzler, GSA (Sociology)
Alli Adam (Fall), Xochitl Briseño (Winter and Spring), A.S.

Selection of New FEC Members

Ralph Armbruster-Sandoval completed his three-year term on the FEC. Dorota Dutsch was appointed chair of the Classics Department and therefore needed to step down from the FEC. In Spring 2019, a call for nominations was sent to all L&S faculty and the following new members were elected to serve on the FEC for three-year terms: Walid Afifi (Communication) and Sabine Fruhstuck (East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies).
The FEC has requested that the Committee on Committees appoint one representative from the Social Sciences and one from Mathematical, Life, and Physical Sciences for one-year terms to fill additional vacancies until the next FEC election cycle.

Submitted September 2019
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met a total of 56 times, 2 hours per session, during the 2018-19 term. All meetings were held in executive session. In addition, CAP leadership met weekly with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel throughout the 2018-19 personnel cycle.

Executive Summary

The Committee on Academic Personnel serves as a reviewing agency for all “expanded review” academic personnel actions and as an auditing agency for all additional academic personnel actions; equitably evaluates and reports recommendations for such actions in accordance with campus and systemwide guidelines; and provides advice on UC and campus issues pertaining to academic personnel.

The 2018-19 academic year included the following:

- Reviewed 331 academic personnel cases (including 24 post audits of Dean’s Authority cases), resulting in 383 personnel actions in 2018-19
- Reviewed the biannual proposed revisions to the Red Binder
- Reviewed proposed changes to departmental bylaws with respect to departmental voting procedures
- Provided advice to the Senate Chair, the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC), the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel (AVC), and the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) on a number of UC policy issues.
- Met and consulted with the deans, the AVC, and the EVC on the academic personnel review process at both the beginning and end of the 2018-19 cycle
- Participated in orientations for department chairs and personnel analysts regarding the academic personnel review process
I. Academic Personnel Actions

CAP devoted most of its work to reviewing appointments, expanded review merit advancements, and promotions. A total of 383 personnel actions were reviewed; a summary of the workload appears in Tables I and II attached to this report. CAP members recused themselves from cases from their own departments and in cases of conflict of interest, or the potential for perceived conflict of interest, with the candidate. The deans continued the established practice of review of normative merit advancements (Dean’s Authority) and appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor Steps II and III at starting salaries within a defined range, whenever the recommendations of deans and departments agreed. In those cases in which salary recommendations between the respective dean and CAP differed by $4,000 or more, Associate Vice Chancellor Butler issued a Tentative Decision to one or both parties for comment. CAP conducted post audits of all Dean’s Authority merit cases and case deferrals of professors at the Assistant Professor or Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment ranks, subsequent to the actions of the deans. A Post Audit Report was submitted at the end of the cycle to the AVC of Academic Personnel.

CAP’s review of individual merit and promotion cases, in accordance with Red Binder policy and APM 210-1-d, focused for the Professor series on the 4 areas of (a) research and creative activities, (b) teaching and mentoring, (c) professional activities, and (d) service, and for the Lecturer SOE series on the 3 review areas of (a) teaching, (b) scholarly and professional activity, and (c) service. In its review, CAP took into account contributions to diversity and equal opportunity, following guidelines in APM 210-1-d and Red Binder I-75-VIII. CAP encourages candidates to submit (when appropriate) optional self-assessments concerning teaching, research, and contributions to diversity, respectively. These optional documents often provide valuable information that assists reviewing agencies in making more informed evaluations of personnel cases.

II. Review Committees

CAP continued to act as its own ad hoc review committee for promotion to tenure cases in which both the dean and the department recommended tenure. In addition, CAP continued the practice of waiving ad hoc review committees for other promotion and career reviews unless deemed necessary for fair and equitable judgment. (No such cases arose in 2018-19.) CAP convened a “Shadow CAP,” appointed by AVC Butler, to evaluate Expanded Review merit cases of current CAP members.

III. Academic Personnel Policy Issues

A number of policy issues were notable in the course of the 2018-19 academic year, some of longstanding concern. These included:

Solicitation of Extramural Letters for Appointments, Promotions, and Barrier Steps
In a number of cases, CAP found the set of extramural letters submitted with the dossier to depart unduly from Red Binder guidelines. CAP (like other reviewing agencies) may request that additional letters be obtained in such cases, which can significantly delay case consideration. Departments are reminded to follow carefully Red Binder guidelines in soliciting extramural letters, or to provide a compelling explanation when those guidelines cannot be followed.
Service
As one of the areas of review, CAP treats service (of scope appropriate to rank) as an integral component in making its recommendations. CAP thus expects faculty and departments to give this area appropriate attention. In addition to service on Academic Senate committees, the Office of Academic Personnel has compiled a list of other possible campus service opportunities to assist faculty in this area: https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.academic.employees/service.opportunities.pdf

Providing Context
CAP at times finds it challenging to evaluate the diverse range of campus service, especially in connection with UCSB’s many research centers and ORUs. In addition, CAP sometimes has difficulty assessing achievements such as prizes or awards. CAP depends upon departments and deans to provide context for understanding the nature and scope of a candidate’s service or the importance of an award.

Collaborative Research
CAP occasionally finds it difficult to evaluate a candidate’s contribution to collaborative research, especially when there are large numbers of co-authors on publications. CAP depends upon departments to provide sufficient background to allow reviewing agencies to evaluate the nature and scope of a candidate’s contributions.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching and Accounting for Teaching Load
CAP notes with concern that a number of departments did not fully adhere to Red Binder requirements for the evaluation and documentation of teaching. For evaluating the teaching record, Red Binder I-34-VI states: “At a minimum, two sources must be included in the case. ESCI summary sheets and scores for questions A and B are mandatory.” Moreover, numerous departments failed to provide an accurate account of candidates’ teaching loads over the review period. Red Binder I-27 requires that “The bio-bib should also contain a statement of normal teaching workload for the department overall (e.g., 2-2-1) and a brief explanation of any deviations from this workload (e.g., sabbatical, administrative assignment).” Regarding evidence of teaching to be submitted with a case, Red Binder states in section I-75-V: “Reviewing agencies will return cases to the departments if they do not conform to these guidelines.” CAP hopes that policy on criteria for the evaluation of teaching and accounting for the teaching load will be closely followed to avoid delays in processing personnel cases.

Salary Recommendations for New Appointments
CAP has a standard practice of making salary recommendations for new appointments, but there has occasionally been significant divergence between CAP’s recommendations and those of departments and deans. CAP notes that Red Binder I-8-II requires departmental recommendations for off-scale appointments to include “documentation of the market conditions that justify” the proposed salary. Salary recommendations for new appointments have been further complicated by the passage in 2017 of California State Legislation AB 168, which prohibits employers from inquiring about or relying upon salary history as a factor in determining pay.

IV. Campus Issues

Revisions to Departmental Bylaws
CAP received proposals from 2 departments to revise their bylaws in ways that would affect departmental voting procedures in personnel matters. As required by Senate Bylaw 55 (Divisional Bylaw 205), CAP reviewed these proposals and provided these departments with responses.

CAP FAQ Regarding the Academic Personnel Review Process
CAP created a document that answers frequently asked questions about the academic review process at UCSB and the role of the faculty senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The information is available via the Academic Senate website and the Academic Personnel website.

**Lecturer SOE Series Transition to New Salary Scale**
Due to revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) in October 2018, all appointees on the Lecturer SOE track needed to be assigned to a corresponding step on the new Lecturer SOE salary scales. CAP served as one of the reviewing agencies for placements on the new salary scale and provided recommendations to AVC Butler.

**Revisions to the Red Binder**
The Office of Academic Personnel disseminates to all Senate Faculty and appropriate administrators and committees any proposed revisions to the Red Binder, typically biannually in the fall and spring. CAP reviewed the proposed revisions circulated for comment in February 2019, which included significant changes concerning the Lecturer SOE series implementing system-wide revisions to APM 210-3.

**Updating Evaluation Guidelines for Creative/Performing Art Disciplines**
CAP invited HFA Dean Majewski to work with the relevant departments to update guidelines that have helped reviewing agencies understand and evaluate creative/performance work in a manner consistent with other scholarly work.

**V. Systemwide Issues**

**Recommendations for the Use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements for Academic Reviews at the University of California**
At the request of divisional Chair Bohn, CAP reviewed recommendations from the University Committee for Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) for the use of Statements on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in UC academic reviews. After reviewing the recommendations, CAP conveyed its opposition to the recommendation that DEI statements be required at UCSB in the personnel review process.

**Recommendations for the Use of DEI Statements for Academic Appointments at the University of California**
At the request of EVC Marshall, CAP reviewed recommendations for the use of Statements on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion for UC academic appointments, recommendations that were unanimously endorsed by the Academic Council. Of all the UC campuses, UCSB and UC Berkeley are the only campuses that do not currently require these statements in recruitments. After reviewing the recommendations, CAP conveyed its support of the recommendation that DEI statements be required at UCSB in the faculty recruitment process. For the record, CAP also noted that this support does not alter CAP’s opposition to requiring DEI statements at other stages in the review process.

**Informational Materials**
CAP reviewed informational documents about ongoing systemwide discussions, as well as pertinent academic personnel approaches at other UC campuses. Informational materials included the following:

- Proposed revision of Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harrassment
- Systemwide review of proposed changes to Senate Bylaw 336
- Systemwide review of proposed new APM, Section 011, Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees (AMP - 011)
- Policy regarding the death of a faculty member with a pending promotion
- Academic Council concerns regarding the use of Research Information Management Systems (RIMS)
- Recommendations for Equity Advisor Programs at UC
- Academic Council statement regarding racialization of espionage concerns
- Issuance of technical revisions to APM section 715, Leaves of Absence/Family and Medical Leave
- Issuance of technical revisions to APM section 120, Emerita/Emeritus titles.
- 2019-2020 Academic Salary Scales Issuance

VI. Carry-over Issues for 2018-19

- Campuswide audit of all departments’ and colleges’ voting bylaws
- Updating of Arts/Performance-based disciplines’ guidelines for evaluating research/creative activities
- Continued discussion among reviewing agencies of areas of concern from Section III: extramural letters, service expectations, documentation of teaching performance

VII. Acknowledgments and Appreciation

UCSB’s process for reviewing faculty merit cases is complex and time-consuming, as it is designed to satisfy both UC’s tradition of shared governance and a strong desire on all sides to treat faculty across campus in an equitable and transparent fashion. The practice of having one faculty committee that looks at all campus cases grows from and upholds UCSB’s unique culture of interdisciplinary collaboration and cooperation. The entire complex process works only because of the committed efforts of many different individuals and groups, too numerous to name here.

CAP deeply appreciates the enormous amount of labor that departmental chairs, personnel committees, and analysts expend each Fall in preparing cases for review. CAP also thanks the home departments of this year’s committee for allowing our members to rearrange their own departmental workloads in order to accommodate the rigorous demands of CAP service.

CAP thanks the Academic Senate staff, headed by Debra Blake, and its information technology staff, headed by Andy Satomi, for unfailing support, assistance, and advice in all matters.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I - Summary of All Personnel Actions Reviewed by CAP 2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair and visiting professor appts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring CAP review (Prof Above, Prof VI, Accel Merits, Lecturers PSOE, SOE, Sr SOE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Appraisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Reviews/No Change (included in Merits total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Waivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II - Faculty Participation on Ad Hoc Review Committees 2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP continued to act as its own ad hoc review committee in promotion to tenure cases in which both deans and departments recommended tenure. In addition, CAP continued the practice of waiving ad hoc review committees for other promotion and career reviews unless deemed necessary for fair and equitable judgment (no such cases in 2018-19).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Appointments requiring Ad Hoc Review | 0 |
| Promotions requiring Ad Hoc Review | 0 |
| Merits requiring Ad Hoc Review | 0 |
| Other Actions requiring Ad Hoc Review | 0 |
| **Total number of Ad Hoc Review Committees** | **0** |

**Total number of cases submitted to CAP covering 383 personnel actions:** 331
### Table III - 20-YEAR COMPARISON OF ALL PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments requiring CAP review (includes endowed chair appts)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (to Lecturer SOE, Associate Professor, Professor)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits requiring CAP review</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retentions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal appraisals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Reviews/No Change (included in Merits total)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsiderations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series Transfers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Appointment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Waivers (prev. EOR's)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Audits of Dean's Authority (prev. Routine) Cases</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentatives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEWED BY CAP**

| 383 | -19 | 402 | 348 | 400 | 386 | 356 | 356 | 341 | 430 | 334 | 334 | 413 | 422 | 395 | 421 | 439 | 368 | 415 | 336 | 456 |

**Average number of cases per year based on 19-year data:**

387
Executive Summary

Purpose (per Bylaw 87): To set standards and criteria for undergraduate admissions and monitor campus efforts to recruit and enroll an excellent and diverse undergraduate student body.

Issues of General Concern to Faculty:

- UC Transfer Guarantee program
- General Standards for Proposals from Departments on Admissions Changes
- Review of Athletic Admissions Policies and Procedures in Light of the Recent Admissions Scandal

CAERS held 13 regularly scheduled 90-minute meetings during the 2018-19 academic year and consulted with relevant campus administrators regarding specific issues within its purview. The Committee met with Chancellor Henry T. Yang, Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall, Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Jeffrey Stopple, Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Science, Pierre Wiltzius, Dean of the College of Engineering (COE) Rod Alferness, and the chairs of the departments within the COE. The committee benefits from the expertise of several regular consultants who assist CAERS in monitoring and guiding UCSB’s admission and enrollment efforts. All of the committee’s deliberations were informed by relevant UCSB and/or systemwide student data.

Campus Issues

Admissions Decision Model (ADM) Changes

Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) reported to the Committee regarding the components of the Admissions Decision Model (ADM) and how they are weighted. High school GPA and SAT scores are used as a predictor of student success. A regression model is applied to UCSB first-year GPAs to obtain the percentage weighting for the academic components. They also presented the first-year GPA data for the cohort of freshmen who took the redesigned SAT (RSAT). IRPA proposed new weights for test scores and high school GPA, based on the results of their most recent study. CAERS approved the adoption of the new weights for the College of Letters and Science.

Proposal for Transfer Screening Changes in Mathematics
CAERS considered a revised proposal from the Department of Mathematics to require additional preparatory coursework for transfer applicants. Based on the compelling rationale and data provided by the Department, the Committee accepted the proposed requirement changes.

General Standards for Proposals from Departments on Admissions Changes

CAERS approved a set of guidelines for departments who express interest in proposing changes to the screening of preparatory coursework for transfer applicants. Important features of the guidelines include a two-year advance notification period for the California Community Colleges, analysis of the most recent transfer cohorts, and academic support currently provided to transfer students by the department.

Meeting with the College of Engineering - Undergraduate Enrollment

Representatives from CAERS held a meeting with the administrators in the College of Engineering (COE) to discuss the balance between enrollment in the (COE) and the College of Letters and Science (L&S). Overall, the University has experienced a period of growth that has resulted in student enrollment disparities and impacted departments, particularly in the Division of Mathematical, Life, and Physical Sciences. Given the demand for COE majors, CAERS inquired about the possibility of the College increasing its undergraduate enrollment. Though additional resources would be required to expand the respective degree programs, the College agreed to begin implementing measured increases in enrollment.

Upcoming Discussion on the Bell Curve and Scoring Guide for Application Reviews

The Office of Admissions initiated a long-term discussion about the possibility of recalibrating the scoring guide for application reviews. Historical data indicated that readers are not using the full range of application read scores, and as such, there is the potential to revisit the scoring guide. The Office of Admissions asked CAERS members to review the reader training materials and consider potential changes that might be recommended. Members emphasized the need to ensure that any changes would not negatively affect first-generation students or those from underrepresented minority groups. CAERS agreed to revisit the issue at a later date.

Standardized Testing

CAERS discussed a number of concerns related to the use of standardized tests in admissions, including their validity, security, and the criteria for accommodations. Members referenced recent news articles in which it was mentioned that students who receive accommodations, such as extra test-taking time, are disproportionately from affluent families. The Committee was informed that a systemwide taskforce was charged with reviewing related issues. CAERS agreed to follow the systemwide discussion and revisit the issue in 2019-20.

CollegeBoard’s Environmental Dashboard
CollegeBoard piloted an Environmental Dashboard designed to provide universities with data on prospective students’ socioeconomic environment. The Dashboard assigned each student an “adversity score” to give context to their academic performance. According to IRPA’s analysis, the Environmental Dashboard indicators were highly correlated with the existing campus formula, which was designed to replace California’s Academic Performance Index (API) following its discontinuation in 2013. Members raised concern about the wisdom of using a private product, the potential for misuse of the product, security, and cost. Following the committee’s discussion, CollegeBoard decided to abandon the adversity score in response to significant public criticism. The company will continue to provide contextual information on students’ schools and neighborhoods. The Committee planned to discuss the issue in more detail in 2019-20.

Review of Athletic Admissions Policies and Procedures in Light of the Recent Admissions Scandal

Following reports of the nationwide admissions scandal in higher education, CAERS and the Office of Admissions began to examine ways in which admissions policies and procedures might be improved to minimize the risk of fraud. President Napolitano ordered an internal audit of UC admissions practices, and UCSB Audit and Advisory Services met with the relevant offices to examine existing practices and recommended improvements.

As part of this effort, CAERS approved a new Athletic-Admissions Slot Review Policy, which is designed to tighten procedures and incorporate greater faculty involvement in the review of application materials for student athletes. The policy will be adjusted as needed following the pilot year of its use. The Committee also met with Intercollegiate Athletics to discuss its practices for recruiting and recommending prospective student athletes, and inquired about the historical participation records for each athletic team.

CAERS will continue these activities throughout the 2019-20 academic year.

Systemwide Issues

As UCSB’s representative on the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), Madeleine Sorapure regularly updated the Committee regarding issues that were being addressed by BOARS. One of the major issues discussed at BOARS, which included consultation with the divisional committees, included the proposed UC Transfer Guarantee proposals. CAERS members strongly opposed the guarantee as designed, and felt that it would not create additional access to UC. Further, CAERS found the details of the proposed plan to be disordered, and anticipated that it would cause significant confusion for students and counselors. Members felt that the proposed plan had little utility beyond the benefit of political relationships.

Members voiced their opposition to basing the UCTG on the existing Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) programs, as Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego do not offer TAGs. The
remaining six campuses will be unduly burdened and predicting yield will be volatile. The committee reiterated their earlier inquiry about majors beyond the 21 currently included in the Transfer Pathways.

Along with other Senate councils and committees, members of CAERS were invited to review materials pertaining to the following systemwide issues:

1. Proposed Revision of Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
2. TAG Changes and Notice to the California Community Colleges

**CAERS Members**

Paul Spickard, Chair  
Mahdi Abu-Omar  
Juan Campo  
Michael Gordon  
Skirmantas Janusonis  
Lorraine Lisiecki  
Miriam Metzger  
John S.W. Park  
Philip Pincus  
Lisa Przekop, Director of Admissions (Ex-Officio)  
Madeleine Sorapure, BOARS Representative  
Guofang Wei  
Tao Yang  

Consultants:  
Donna Coyne, Associate Director, Office of Admissions  
Michael Miller, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services  
Steven Velasco, Director, Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment  
Laurel Wilder, Associate Director, Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment  

CAERS Analyst – Shasta Delp
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Committee Charge
The charge of the Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE) is to work towards attaining the campus goals of diversity and equity and actively pursue the goals of affirmative action.

Membership
The Committee on Diversity & Equity consists of a Chair and at least five members. The Director of the Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention Office and Director of the Title IX & Sexual Harassment Policy Compliance Office serve as ex-officios on the committee. In addition, there is one non-Senate academic representation, one undergraduate student, and one graduate student representative.

Summary of CDE activities over 2018-19
There were a total of fifteen meetings of the Committee over the 2018-19 term. CDE’s primary areas of focus during the term were: 1) awarding the inaugural Faculty Diversity award; 2) Contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statements and Faculty Equity Advisor programs and their implementation on the UCSB campus; 3) reviewing systemwide and divisional policy proposals and revisions.

CDE discussed all of these topics at length and shared its recommendations with Academic Senate Chair Henning Bohn when appropriate. Topics and recommendations are briefly described below.

Reviews of Systemwide UC Issues

Proposed Revision of Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
In October, CDE reviewed the Proposed Revision of Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (SVSH). CDE was very supportive of the changes, which offer greater clarity and increased inclusivity, especially the increased authority and role of the Title IX Officer. CDE sent forward a memorandum with two suggestions: that the 90-day timeframe be implemented to minimize confusion and appropriately manage expectations of all involved parties, and that the UC Non-Discrimination Policy be revised accordingly to incorporate the level of specificity found in the SVSH policy.

Draft Executive Summary of the Task Force on Universitywide Policing
In December, CDE reviewed the draft executive summary of the report by the Task Force on Universitywide Policing. CDE objected to the very short timeline given to respond to this important issue. Policing on UC campuses is a critical issue and it deserves to have a full review by the Academic Senate. Members did not feel they had the appropriate time or expertise to adequately comment on the report.

CDE sent forward a memorandum with this objection as well as the following concerns:
• Ensure that independent advisory boards are constituted by a diverse and representative membership.
• Trainings need to be ongoing and include monitoring and assessment.
CDE also offered its expertise and involvement with efforts outlined in the report, and would like to review and comment on the final report when available.

**Reviews of Campus Issues**

**Faculty Diversity Award**
In October, CDE reviewed the final draft of the Faculty Diversity Award (FDA) guidelines, approved by last year’s Committee. The Executive Council decided they wanted to discuss the FDA in depth and in person, so a Faculty Legislature vote to approve the award and guidelines was postponed until January.

Also in October, Associate Vice-Chancellor Maria Herrera-Sobek joined a meeting and thanked Chair Scott and CDE for their hard work on getting the FDA to this point. AVC Herrera-Sobek explained that years ago there was support and funding for a diversity award, but it did not come to fruition. Other campuses have ended up creating diversity awards, so it is exciting that UCSB will finally have one. The Committee also discussed with the AVC ways to publicize the FDA once approved, and some members volunteered to help with flyer text and design.

In December, CDE discussed the name of the award and questioned whether it could be changed. In particular, it was noted that all of the other Senate awards contain descriptors such as “Distinguished”, “Outstanding”, or some similar adjective. Without a similar label, the name of the award may seem too generic and unclear to some what is being recognized. Ultimately, Executive Council approved the name Faculty Diversity Award, and that had to be kept for this year. CDE could review the name in the future. The Committee also finalized the timeline for the FDA nomination, review and notification process.

The Faculty Diversity Award was approved by the Faculty Legislature at its January 10 meeting. At its February meetings, CDE crafted a scoring rubric to be used for FDA nominations and finalized its timeline and procedures. At its April 8 meeting, the members of the Faculty Diversity Award selection committee (almost the full CDE membership) discussed the final candidates and chose the 2019 recipient, Diane Fujino, Professor in the Department of Asian American Studies.

In its final meetings of the year, CDE discussed various aspects of the FDA and changes that could be made in the future. Topics included trying to fund more than one award per year, giving out honorable mentions, and revising the scoring rubric to better reflect the variety of ways faculty contribute to diversity efforts.

**EVC Request for Senate Comments on Recommendations for the Use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Statements for Academic Positions at UC**
In March, CDE discussed the Academic Council recommendations for the use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Statements for academic positions at UC. The Committee wondered what these recommendations were actually changing, as there was not a proposal to review and no new requirements.

In May, CDE reviewed a memo from EVC Marshall, written in response to the Provost and UCAADE recommendations regarding every UC campus using these DEI Statements. Provost Brown was requesting that UCSB adopt the use of these statements in faculty hiring; eight of the ten campuses already use them, and UCB is in the process of formalizing the requirement. Members discussed that more concrete wording needs to be used for all six recommendations. They were confused by the discrepancy between recommendation number six, which stated
that DEI statements will be used in merit and promotion cases. However, it was also noted that “DEI statements do not represent a new criterion for evaluation”. It was also unclear how these DEI statements would interact with the proposed Faculty Equity Advisor program. CDE supported the UC Academic Council recommendation that all UC campuses and the APM use the same language, and that “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements” be used by all parties. A memorandum with these comments was sent forward.

Diversity Training for Faculty Hiring Committees and Faculty Equity Advisor Program

Fall quarter, CDE continued their discussion from previous years about ideas for diversity training for faculty hiring committees. A pivotal question the Committee pondered was whether training should be recommended or required of all faculty. Campus administration has differing opinions about requiring more training for faculty. Members had ideas including requiring three faculty from every search committee to attend the Office of Equal Opportunity & Discrimination Prevention’s (EODP) presentation, requiring just one faculty member (possibly the diversity representative) to attend and strongly encouraging all other members, or requiring a majority of the search committee depending on the total number of faculty. There was the suggestion that search funds should not be released until the committee has completed its diversity training. Members also discussed how often faculty would need to take the training. Information can change from year to year, so ideas ranged from every five years, every three years, to every time there is a search. There were questions about how this information would be tracked.

Director Ricardo Alcaíno of EODP explained his office’s role in reviewing faculty searches and making recommendations for improvement. CDE also looked at Placement Goal data, the Affirmative Action Plan, and had Director Alcaíno present to CDE the actual “Applying AA/EO/Diversity Practices to Academic Searches” presentation that departments receive. Senate Chair Bohn tasked Chair Scott with creating a list of resources available to the hiring committee diversity representatives.

Winter quarter, CDE learned that the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) had a draft of a faculty equity advisor program. The draft proposal was first distributed to all Deans, who were apparently all supportive. The draft did not mention any Senate vetting or involvement. Funding for the program would come from the EVC’s office as well as AVC Herrera-Sobek’s office. Members believed pressure to create a program came from the Office of the President.

The proposal included many aspects that CDE has previously discussed including in an equity advisor program, including stipends, course release, and substantial training. However, members had concerns regarding how many equity advisors each School/College/Division would have; how Deans would choose the equity advisors; what type of training equity advisors would receive; when the program would start; if the equity advisors would take the place of the diversity representative each hiring committee is supposed to have; and that this is an administration driven proposal with no Senate oversight.

EVC Marshall attended the January 28 CDE meeting. He presented CDE with an overview of diversity initiatives in Academic Affairs, including Faculty Diversity Enrichment Awards for new appointments of faculty whose research, teaching and/or service will advance diversity, student support centers like ONDAS and the Transfer Student Center and Hispanic-Serving Institution grants, and working with Graduate Division’s diversity initiatives.
EVC Marshall then explained that the Faculty Equity Advisor (FEA) program is a work in progress. The first steps are to define the position and the responsibilities. Design, implementation and coordination of the program still need to be worked out. The main focus should be on faculty recruitment and retention, while allowing Deans to focus on areas of emphasis to meet their specific needs. The goal is to have the FEA program in place by July 1. Members had a variety of questions about the proposed program, including timeframe, the model of having one faculty member responsible for diversity for a whole department, and how the proposal is being vetted on campus. EVC Marshall encouraged CDE to send him any comments and concerns they have about the proposal.

At its following meetings, CDE continued to discuss the FEA proposal. One of the main concerns CDE had was that the proposal seemingly did not need to go through Academic Senate Review. The FEA program is being viewed as administrative, and apparently the Senate does not have to be consulted. CDE then received another FEA proposal authored by AVC Herrera-Sobek. Chair Scott had conversations with EVC Marshall and AVC Herrera-Sobek addressing how they are working together to move forward with one proposal.

AVC Herrera-Sobek and her assistant attended the April 22 CDE meeting. Her assistant presented extensive research on FEA programs at other universities. A new draft of the proposed FEA program was distributed and AVC Herrera-Sobek expressed that she would appreciate feedback. AVC Herrera-Sobek was envisioning creating a training academy that FEAs would attend at the beginning of the academic year. FEAs would have a day-long workshop on diversity issues and outside speakers could be bought in. Members were encouraged to suggest training topics they would like to see. Members also discussed the new draft, including concern about the EVC appointing the FEAs (instead of the Chief Diversity Officer), the responsibilities of the FEAs, and concern that the establishment of the program is happening very quickly, and there is miscommunication across the campus.

CDE will plan to consult with the EVC and AVC’s office first thing fall quarter about how implementation of the FEA program is progressing.

Library Organizational Changes
In May, CDE discussed a report from UCSB Librarian Kristin Antelman describing the proposed organizational changes to the Library, which include the creation of new departments and reforming some of the subject librarian duties. Members supported Librarian Antelman’s forward-looking approach to making much-needed structural changes, but strongly felt that any re-organization plan needed to be shared with departments and allowed time for the appropriate consultations. CDE’s comments also stressed that the library is one of the most important resources for diversifying graduate and undergraduate populations, and that it should be robustly supported by the University.

Pending Issues for CDE in 2019-20
- Robust consultation about the new Faculty Equity Advisor program.
- Continuing discussions about the use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statements.
- Revising the Faculty Diversity Award guidelines in preparation for the second awarding.
- Consulting with a wider range of constituents on campus who work with diversity issues.
- Continued discussion and understanding the role of APM 220 for faculty promotion and review. The exploration has been a pending issue for CDE since 2016-17.
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To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on International Education (CIE) held nine regularly scheduled meetings during the academic year and consulted with relevant campus administrators regarding issues within its purview.

Executive Summary

As per the Academic Senate bylaws, the purpose of CIE is “to provide advice and consent on all matters of international education and exchange, including practices that impact exchange students and scholars.”

During the 2018-2019 academic year, CIE

- Provided review of Memorandums of Understanding with international institutions
- Implemented the 5th biennial survey of international undergraduate students; analysis of the results to be distributed in fall 2019; responses to results and committee recommendations considered for 2019-20
- Reviewed systemwide policy concerning UC international activities
- Consulted with administration as needed including Simran Singh (Director, Office of International Students), Leesa Beck (Registrar), Juan Campo (Director, UCSB Education Abroad Program), David Marshall (Executive Vice Chancellor), Lisa Przekop (Director, Office of Admissions), Tricia Rascon (Director of Orientation Programs & Parent Services), and Paul Spickard (Chair, Committee on Admissions, Enrollment & Relations with Schools)
International Agreements

Memorandum of Understanding – UCSB Center for Catalan Studies and the University of Alicante on behalf of the Institut d’Estudis Catalans
The committee reviewed and did not endorse the MOU between the UCSB Center for Catalan Studies and the Institute for Catalan Studies (IEC) on behalf of the University of Alicante. The main goals of the MOU were to create a system for exchange of professors, researchers, and post-doctoral students to UCSB and universities with faculty belonging to the IEC. The MOU also involved an annual conference on Catalan Studies (to be held at UCSB), and sponsoring of publications. CIE decided to no endorse the MOU for several reasons including a lack of clarity regarding academic departments’ support and commitment to the MOU as well as insufficient clarity regarding the status of IEC and the degree to which the University of Alicante would be involved.

Memorandum of Understanding between the National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS), UCSB and the Erasmus Mundus Master Course on Maritime Spatial Planning (EMMCMSP), Universita’ Iuav di Venezia
CIE reviewed and endorsed the MOU, but the committee also recommended clarification of some aspects of the agreement.

Memorandum of Understanding between the College of Engineering, UCSB and School of Engineering, School of Materials and Chemical Technology, and School of Environment and Society, Tokyo Institute of Technology (Renewal)
CIE reviewed and endorsed the renewal of this MOU.

Memorandum of Understanding between UCSB (EALCS) and the Korea Foundation (Renewal)
CIE reviewed and endorsed the renewal of this MOU.

Survey of International Undergraduate Students

This year, CIE conducted its 5th biennial survey of international undergraduate students in May - June 2019. The survey was commissioned by the Academic Senate, carried out by the Office of Budget and Planning, Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment (IRPA), with support from the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor. The online questionnaire was distributed via email to undergraduate international students, of which 461 completed the survey, resulting in a final response rate of 21.8%. The survey results were analyzed by a graduate student in the Statistics and Applied Probability Department and further comparative analysis continued over the summer. The final report will be distributed in fall 2019. Current overall findings are highlighted as follows:

- Undergraduate survey respondents included students from 36 countries. The four countries with the most respondents were mainland China (80.6%), Taiwan (3.1%), South Korea (2.4%), and Japan (2.0%).
- 75.9% of respondents were admitted as freshmen and 24.1% were admitted as transfer students.
- 78.8% of respondents are part of the College of Letters and Sciences with 39.5% in the Division of Mathematics, Life and Physical Science (MLPS) and 30.4% in the Social Sciences. 10.1% of the survey participants are in the College of Engineering.
• 55.6% were satisfied or very satisfied with their overall academic experience at UCSB, a very slight decrease from the 2017 survey (58.5%) and a significant decrease from the 2011 survey when 84% reported they were satisfied or very satisfied.
• 41.6% of respondents said they were very satisfied or satisfied with their overall social experience at UCSB.
• 77.3% of respondents reported that they feel they are valued members of the UCSB community and 41.2% said they agree or strongly agree that they are equally respected on campus. However, 16.2% indicated that they have experienced physical threats, verbal threats, and damage to their personal property due to their race, ethnicity, nationality, or religion.
• 48.9% respondents have major or some difficulty in finding housing.
• The most common issues participants reported having trouble getting help with on campus were academic difficulties, registering for classes, handling stress, and English language skills.
• There were three leading factors that correlated with satisfaction in overall social experience: opportunities to make friends, meet people from a different country, and to make friends with American students; overall academic experience; and satisfaction with help received to develop English language proficiency.
• There were four top factors that correlated with satisfaction in overall academic experience: overall social experience; opportunities to make friends, meet people from a different country, and to make friends with American students; effectiveness of UCSB communicating information and guidance about academic standards, expectations of a US research University; and the overall sense of being a valued member of the UCSB community.

CIE will consider the findings and analysis of the survey in fall of 2019. The Committee will disseminate findings and will seek engagement from campus stakeholders to formulate a campus response.

Details of the survey results and Committee recommendations will be finalized in the Committee’s Report on International Undergraduate Students at UCSB 2019, which will be available upon request from the Academic Senate.

Information Items

• Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Bylaw-336
• Letter Regarding the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE)
• UC Transfer Guarantee Proposal
• Proposed Revision of Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
• Academic Council Response to Reports from Two Tiger Teams on International Research and Students

Local Issues

OISS Proposal to Implement Hard Registration Blocks to Enforce Compliance with US Federal Registrar and Homeland Security
CIE reviewed OISS’s Proposal to Implement Hard Registration Blocks. After discussing the proposal and receiving additional information about the functionality of hard registration blocks from the Office of the Registrar, CIE reached consensus in support of OISS’s proposal. In addition to supporting the proposal, CIE also suggested that OISS track the outcome of using hard blocks in this manner to determine whether it is an effective way to bring students into compliance.
Student Conduct – Degree Clearance Proposal
CIE reviewed and discussed the proposal to change the UCSB Senate Regulations to require compliance with the Student Code of Conduct for final degree conferral. The committee consulted Leesa Beck (University Registrar) to clarify questions related to the judicial process. CIE consultant Simran Singh (Director of OISS) also clarified the role of OISS in maintaining communications with Office of Judicial Affairs and Registrar’s office as relates to any international students being investigated for conduct violation. CIE endorsed the proposal, with the expectation that the timeline of the adjudication process for conduct violation cases can be prioritized for those students who are very close to graduation, in order that the time to process does not adversely affect the future academic plans of students who might eventually be found to be not responsible.

Systemwide Issues

Current State Assessment Report for Systemwide Mexico Entities
CIE reviewed the report and provided comments on three aspects of the report. First, CIE recommended that the location remain in UC Riverside and did not find arguments to move it to UC San Diego to be compelling. Second, in regards to branding, CIE recommended keeping the UC-MEXUS brand as it has name recognition, historical impact, and is well-respected in Mexico. Third, CIE supported the proposal to consolidate the three entities under one umbrella, especially given the clear majority support from the stakeholders, and the diminishing budgets that were stretched across three entities.

Coordination with Administration

Simran Singh, Director, Office of International Students & Scholars (OISS)
The Director of OISS is a frequent attendee of meetings and is a valuable resource to inform CIE of current OISS initiatives, as well as news and policies that relate to the international community on campus.

Leesa Beck, Registrar, Office of the Registrar
The Registrar was consulted for clarification on the proposal concerning student conduct and degree clearance.

Juan Campo, Director, UCSB Education Abroad Program
The Director of EAP is an ex officio member of the Committee and acts as a resource regarding information about EAP.

David Marshall, Executive Vice Chancellor, UCSB
The Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor provided continued support for CIE’s biennial survey of international undergraduate students. CIE worked with EVC Marshall to add several new questions to the survey for 2019.

Lisa Przekop, Director, UCSB Office of Admissions
The Director was consulted regarding admissions procedures for international students and methods for testing English proficiency for international students.

Tricia Rascon, Director of Orientation Programs & Parent Services
The Director was consulted regarding orientation programs and procedures for international students,
with particular attention to the registration process and programs to help inform students about the standards for academic integrity at UCSB.

*Paul Spickard, Chair of Committee on Admissions, Enrollment & Relations with Schools (CAERS)*

Chair Spickard was consulted regarding international students admissions and the potential for creating language courses for international students prior to their arrival at UCSB.

**Carry-over Issues and Future Initiatives**

- Survey results distribution
- Campus resources for international students
- Future CIE Workshops, with a focus on discussing survey results with stakeholders
- Monitor needs of international scholars and visiting faculty

**Members:**

- Javier A. Birchenall
- Maurizia Boscagli
- Bernard S. Comrie
- Erika D. Felix
- Tomoyuki Ichiba
- Charles Jones
- Eric Matthys
- Stephan F. Miescher
- Andrew Norris
- Candace J. Waid
- Thomas Weimbs
- Juan E. Campo, EAP Campus Director, Ex Officio
- Marsha G. Bankston, Associate Registrar, Consultant
- Cristina M. Carney, OISS, Consultant
- Sara A. Cook, Assistant Registrar, Consultant
- Simran Singh, OISS, Consultant
- **Sathya Guruswamy, Chair and UCIE Representative**
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJE) provides clarification and interpretation of Senate legislation and Divisional procedures. It also exercises formal supervision over Senate elections and proposed modifications to the Senate manual, prior to action by the Faculty Legislature. Business is generally conducted via email. The committee and Senate Faculty staff processed the following proposals during 2018-19.

Proposed Revision of Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
RJE reviewed proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment. RJE sent forward comments that questioned if body parts contacted must always be “intimate” in order to be in violation, and that referenced issues of “academic merit or academic freedom” and “appropriate academic officer” seemed vague.

Graduate Student Association Representation on Senate Councils and Committees
RJE was asked to consider whether Graduate Student Association representatives should be allowed to serve on more than one Senate council, committee or subcommittee, as the current GSA Bylaws state. Academic Senate practice is to not allow faculty to serve on more than one council or committee at a given time.

After several rounds of discussion, RJE recommended that the GSA should be allowed to continue with its practice of having a GSA officer be a representative on more than one council or committee. RJE also recommended that the GSA Bylaws be revised to accurately reflect all council and committee representation requirements as stated in the Senate Guidelines for Student Representation on Academic Senate Councils and Committees. RJE did indicate that the GSA should consider broader student representation.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Bylaw 336
RJE was asked to review proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336, pertaining to Privilege and Tenure disciplinary cases. RJE sent forward a concern that the shortened timelines will cause fewer cases to go to mediation and push more to the full disciplinary process.

Revision of Divisional Regulation 25 in response to concerns raised by the Office for Civil Rights
RJE reviewed the revision of SB Regulation 25 and Appendix V, pertaining to student grade appeals. RJE supported the proposed changes, but noted an ambiguity in Section C regarding what “unavailing” means. RJE suggested that when Appendix V undergoes further clarification, “unavailing” is better defined. The Faculty Legislature approved the proposed changes to Appendix V at its meeting of March 21, 2019.

Proposed Revision of SB Regulation 125H3
RJE reviewed proposed revisions to Santa Barbara Regulation 125H3, as well as corresponding revisions to SB Regulation 115E, regarding calculation of major GPA. After consideration of the proposal, RJE noted ambiguities around which major program GPA the revisions were actually referring to, and how electives factor into the major GPA. RJE sent these concerns and some sample revised language back to the initiators for clarification.
RJE received a response from the initiators explaining, in more detail, how major GPA calculation works. In its final response, RJE still noted that there was not clear language regarding what courses constitute which GPAs. While supportive of the revisions, RJE recommended further discussions. The Faculty Legislature approved the proposal changes to SB Regulation 125H3 and SB Regulation 115E at its meeting of April 18, 2019.

**Proposal to Establish a Committee on Information Technology within CRIR**
RJE reviewed a proposal from the Chair of the Academic Senate Council on Research and Instructional Resources (CRIR) to establish a Committee on Information Technology, to be a standing committee of CRIR that would focus on computing, cyber security, and information technology issues. RJE supported the creation of the Committee. The Faculty Legislature approved the establishment of the Committee on Information Technology at its meeting of March 21, 2019.

**Proposed Revisions to Systemwide Regulation 636.E – UC Entry Level Writing Requirement**
RJE was asked to review revisions to Senate Regulation 636.E, governing the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). The revision would change how a student already enrolled at a UC campus could subsequently complete the ELWR if they left that campus. RJE approved of the language, and sent forward a comment that the phrase “by petition” be added to the Regulation changes, to indicate the process by which students could have credit granted.

**Student Conduct-Degree Clearance Proposal**
RJE reviewed proposed revisions to various Senate Regulations, to add the language “the candidate shall be in compliance with Student Code of Conduct”, in order for conferral of a student’s degree. Overall, RJE supported this change. However, a subtle question arose regarding an example provided in which there was an allegation but no investigation - was the student technically in violation of the Student Code of Conduct? Would the recommended change apply here? RJE questioned whether the Student Code Violation text presumes innocence until proven guilty, or if an accusation or allegation before an investigation is sufficient to categorize a student as in violation of the Student Code, and thus trigger the withholding of graduation? If so, RJE thought there could be a more explicit statement in the proposed change reflecting those violations of student conduct code before graduation. If not, then the recommendation should refer to the Student Code of Conduct as to what is the minimum sufficient threshold of a violation.

RJE sent forward its comments, and indicated that once all reviewing agency comments were submitted, the proposal would need to be referred back for RJE review of the proposed Regulation changes.

**Proposed Changes to SB Regulation 235**
RJE reviewed proposed changes to Santa Barbara Regulation 235 pertaining to quarterly honors and the use of “Incomplete” grades. RJE found the revisions sound and offered its approval. The Faculty Legislature approved the proposed changes at its meeting of June 6, 2019.

**Fossil Fuel Memorial Vote**
In June, RJE certified the UCSB Division vote on the Fossil Fuels Memorial to the Regents. Senate members were asked to vote on whether “The U.C. Academic Senate petitions the Regents to divest the University’s endowment portfolio of all investments in the 200 publicly traded fossil fuel companies with the largest carbon reserves.” A memo was sent from RJE Chair Rice to Andrew Dickson, Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, reporting that the UCSB Division
voted, via electronic ballot, 284 in favor, 79 against (out of 1,302 eligible voters).

**2018-19 Divisional Election**

In consultation with RJE, the Academic Senate Office conducted its annual nomination process in an effort to seek candidates for the election of three Senate Assembly Representatives, and three members of the Committee on Committees.

**Senate Assembly Representatives**

A total of seven faculty members were nominated for the position of Senate Assembly Representative; three nominations were declined and one was not eligible to serve. As there were three open positions, a ballot was not conducted. Charles Akemann, of Mathematics; Claudio Fogu, of French and Italian; and Nuha Khoury, of History and Art and Architecture, received the requisite number of endorsements and were appointed to serve as Senate Assembly Representatives.

**Committee on Committees**

A total of ten faculty members were nominated to serve on the Committee on Committees; six candidates declined to accept. Four candidates were nominated, accepted the nomination, and received the requisite number of endorsements:

A total of three candidates were nominated for Area C: College of Letters and Science Humanities and Fine Arts Division and College of Creative Studies. As there were three nominees for one available position, a ballot was conducted, with the following results:

**Silvia Bermudez** (Spanish and Portuguese) – 16.67% (14 votes)  
**Constance Penley** (Film and Media Studies) – 30.95% (26 votes)  
**Ann Plane** (History) – 50.00% (42 votes)  
**Abstain** – 2.38% (2 votes)  
**Total Votes** – 84 (22.22%) of 378 eligible voters

Ann Plane received the most votes for Area C: College of Letters and Science Humanities and Fine Arts Division and College of Creative Studies.

The following candidate accepted nomination and received the requisite number of endorsements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lisa Hajjar, Sociology</th>
<th>Area B: College of Letters and Science Social Sciences Division and Gevirtz Graduate School of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As there were no faculty nominations for the position in Area A (College of Letters and Science Mathematical, Life and Physical Sciences Division, and Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management), this position was filled by an appointment by the Committee on Committees.
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To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Executive Summary

Per bylaw 60, the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards (CFW) is tasked with studying and making recommendations on any matter of faculty or broader campus community welfare and academic freedom, and rewarding excellence in research and teaching.

Highlights:

- The Cyber Security Work Group, with the endorsement of CFW, released the updated Electronic Communications Policy. It underwent a public comment period and is intended for rollout to campus in September 2019.
- The Committee on Academic Freedom discussed multiple issues of concern, from revised federal policy on fetal tissue research to requests for information regarding ongoing unpublished research and correspondence with other scholars from organizations whose objectives are intended to impede select academic pursuits.
- CFW subcommittees presented 14 awards in recognition of outstanding achievements in teaching, research, and mentorship, 13 of which were to women.

Council and Committee Meetings

CFW held nine regularly scheduled meetings during the academic year, although one meeting had no binding actions due to lack of quorum. General issues and concerns are summarized below.

Systemwide Issues and Reviews

All system-wide issues CFW responded to are listed below. Issues that CFW reviewed but chose not to opine on are not included.

Task Force on Universitywide Policing Report

CFW reviewed the recommendations of the Task Force on University-wide Policing, but felt unprepared to provide a thorough assessment due to having inadequate background knowledge at hand and insufficient opportunity to consult with relevant parties for the purpose of gathering more information. CFW members supported the overall intentions of the Task Force, with the hope of being invited to offer additional input as further developments emerge. The Council was mindful of the fact that relationships between police personnel and students and faculty are different from campus to campus. Members tended to think that the UCSB campus is one where a largely positive relationship exists between campus police and the rest of the UCSB community.

Systemwide Review of Proposed New APM -011, Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees

The Council reviewed the proposed new APM -011. Members were strongly in favor of extending appropriate protections for academic freedom to librarians and other non-faculty academic appointees. Concern was expressed that this policy would force acceptance of the faculty code of conduct on all covered; whether this was effectively “chipping away” at union protections for librarians; and whether this represented a fair tradeoff for the rights granted to faculty by APM-010, providing academic freedom protections while also imposing restrictions and holding appointees accountable to the faculty code of conduct.

Concerns Regarding Research Information Management Systems (RIMS)

The Council discussed the memo and report from Academic Council regarding Research Information Management Systems (RIMS). Members expressed concern that the information contained in RIMS could be very ambiguous, especially in humanities, and that these systems prioritize form over substance. Some
members expressed concern that this technology would undermine our internal process. The issues are compounded by the lack of transparency and whether information can be removed or retrieved once originally input. Members were not aware of RIMS use in any department on campus. There is concern that companies could use RIMS to identify trends, and be used to help in resource allocation. The council felt that the recommendations made by the academic council were reasonable and agreed the campus should demand more transparency from RIMS vendors. Some members felt that faculty in every department should be made aware of the institutions of RIMS. Some members felt that no departments should use RIMS without declaring how they are using them and obtaining information on how the algorithms are built.

Recommendations for the Use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements for Academic Positions at UC

The Council is in favor of maintaining the current UCSB campus policy that does not require a DEI statement for an academic position application. Members expressed concern about the implications for academic freedom; there should not be ideology involved and this could quickly move to a political litmus test. The consensus was that the contributions are more valuable when they are included optionally. While members were reluctant to be in the minority among UC campuses, they preferred that DEI statements remain something that is recognized as service. They were also wary of the possibility of whitewashing of applications as an unanticipated response to the threat of implicit bias.

Local Business

Faculty Recruitment Allowance Program

Cindy Doherty, Director, Academic Personnel, attended a CFW meeting to clarify the use of Faculty Recruitment Allowance (permitted uses are outlined in APM 190 and Red Binder I-17). Currently, APM 190 allows fairly broad use of faculty recruitment allowance; in the past it was restricted to housing purchase costs, similar to what is described in the UCSB Red Binder. UCSB has maintained more restricted use of these funds, limiting their use to housing purchases, due to the high cost of housing in Santa Barbara. The policy states that the funds should be used within two years of being hired, but UCSB has a blanket exception to the two year limitation. Faculty may use the funds to pay first and last month’s rent if needed, and by exception, may be allowed to use it for monthly rental payments. Recruitment Allowances are not offered to all faculty, but may be part of a recruitment package, given at the Dean’s discretion.

OA2020

All but one member of CFW voted in support of UCSB signing the OA2020 Expression of Interest. It was agreed by the members that this is a complex issue that will require careful monitoring to protect faculty from adverse impacts as negotiations continue.

Chancellor’s Advisory Task Force on Childcare

The Chancellor’s Advisory Task Force on Childcare, with representation from CFW, met four times during the last year to address the high cost and limited availability of childcare on campus. This challenge is particularly acute for parents of infants. The Task Force began evaluation of several infrastructure improvements including renovating existing facilities at Devereux (West Campus) and contracting with Bright Horizons to expand childcare services. As it may take several years before these actions alleviate current shortages, the Chancellor has approved a stop-gap measure to include a $5,000 childcare subsidy as part of start-up packages for assistant and associate professors when campus childcare is not available. The Task Force will continue to evaluate long term solutions to add childcare facilities on campus to meet future faculty, staff, and student demand.

Campus Parking

The Council discussed the lack of adequate parking for faculty and staff on the east side of campus and identified several strategies to try to ease crowding: 1) restore parking to lot 7 (between Psychology and Life Sciences building, which was converted to an access road during the construction of the Bioengineering building and is now reserved for bikes only); 2) adjust designations on current allocations, for example, spaces restricted for Service Vehicles; 3) forbid or limit guest purchases in designated faculty/staff parking; 4) use other, less crowded lots for special event parking; and 5) revisit designation process for Coastal
Access parking. Nestor Covarrubias, Director of Parking Services, attended a CFW meeting to discuss concerns and provide explanations about the parking landscape. The Council will follow-up on this issue in 2019-2020.

Draft UCSB Green Labs Action Plan V6
CFW members reviewed the latest version of the Green Labs Action Plan. Members endorsed the overarching purpose of the plan and progress that has been made thus far.

Library Reorganization
The Council had concerns about the library reorganization plan. Council members expressed concern that primary functions of staff will shift towards crunching numbers and examining circulation, rather than providing liaison support. Members noted that the time for reorganization is due, but there were questions about the motivation. Members were concerned that specific and esoteric questions may not be able to be answered by new expanded-subject librarians. Some members noted that it seemed antiquated that every subject would need a librarian, but that some fields obviously benefit from personalized support. While members were accepting of the changes overall, they wanted more opportunity for input. Members noted some departments have supported a one year moratorium on the changes, and we likewise in favor of such a delay. Members would like to see a larger conversation on the best organization of knowledge through the library to meet the needs of the campus for the future.

Review of Surveys Targeting the UC Community
The council reviewed the memo about third party survey distribution and lamented that the proliferation of surveys makes it difficult to know which surveys are a priority, especially if they overlap in topic. Members discussed the notion of a survey “hub,” possibly run through the UCSB Office of Research to identify surveys of similar scope and encourage collaboration. Council members supported the creation of a hub to facilitate survey collaboration/streamlining.

Committee on Academic Freedom
The Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) met three times during the 2018-19 year. The following issues were of particular interest.

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) & California Public Records Act (CPRA) Requests to UC Faculty
The committee discussed several recent instances of UC professors being impacted negatively by FOIA and CRPA requests in ways that impeded their research. A new bill, AB700, currently in the California Assembly, would provide certain exemptions to CRPA for researchers at public postsecondary educational institutions whose research material is requested. The committee ultimately agreed that AB700 was in the interest of UC faculty. The bill is currently in committee process with the CA State Assembly.

Canary Mission
CAF reviewed the UCAF statement on the Canary Mission organization, a group whose mission is to “document people and groups that promote hatred of the USA, Israel and Jews on North American college campuses.” One former member and one current member of the UCSB History Department are listed in the Canary Mission online database. UCAF has identified the activities of the group as a threat to academic freedom; they expressed concern this source could be consulted in university personnel cases and are taking a stand to discredit the organization.

Subsequently, CFW reviewed a UCSC Academic Senate letter to the UCSC Chancellor requesting that Canary Mission be disavowed as a source in consideration of admissions and faculty personnel decisions. The council discussed whether UCSB should take a position of solidarity with UCSC but did not reach agreement. Some members questioned whether faculty should police reference sources as “honest” or “dishonest,” and whether this action was at odds with academic freedom. The members agreed unanimously that the issue is of concern and they recommend further consideration next year.

Draft UCAF Fetal Tissue Research Statement
The committee reviewed the draft UCAF Fetal Tissue Research Statement and response from Michael
Brown on behalf of Janet Napolitano. All are concerned about the politicization of research funding and will remain vigilant about developments in this arena.

**Cyber Security Working Group**

The Cyber Security Work Group (CSWG) met five times during the 2018-19 academic year.

CSWG’s main focus was updating the Electronics Communication Policy (ECP) to bring it into compliance with the systemwide Electronic Communications Policy.

CSWG presented CFW with revisions to the Electronic Communications Policy. Council members had varying concerns about cybersecurity and potential violations of academic freedom, but ultimately endorsed the policy as written. It was presented to the campus for a 90-day comment period which ended July 22, 2019. Its rollout is planned for September 2019.

CSWG also worked on a Revision of the Campus Network Citizenship document and discussed improved security training for the campus community from Chief Information Security Officer Sam Horowitz. The CSWG is disbanding this year; however, a new Committee on Information Technology has been created under the Council of Research and Instructional Resources.

**Senate Awards**

Four committees reviewed nomination packets for Academic Senate awards for research, teaching, and mentoring. The table below outlines the number of nominations for each award per academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DTA</th>
<th>DTA Total</th>
<th>OTA</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>GMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Non-Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DTA – Distinguished Teaching Award** – Dana Mastro (Communication); Mireille Miller-Young (Feminist Studies); Simone Pulver (Environmental Studies); Heather Royer (Economics); Randalyn Browning (Writing Program, Non-Senate Recipient); Allison Horst (Bren School of Environmental Science & Management, Non-Senate Recipient)

**OTA – Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award** – Olga Faccani (Classics); Ashlee Kalauli (Mathematics); Heather Macias (Education); Anita Stahl (Feminist Studies)

**GMA – Graduate Mentor Award** – Silvia Bermúdez (Spanish and Portuguese); Karen Nylund-Gibson
(Education); Susanne Stemmer (Materials)

**FRL – Faculty Research Lecturer** – Nelson Lichtenstein (History)

All winners received an honorarium and a framed certificate, and were honored at the Faculty Legislature meeting of April 18, 2019.

**Carry-Over Issues**
- Parking Availability on Campus
- Retirement & RASC Communications
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Council: To initiate, coordinate and implement academic planning that promotes the quality and diversity of the academic experience; provide advice on the campus budget, capital planning and allocations of resources and space.

Highlights:

- Council participated in the academic program review of five academic units.
- Council studied FTE plans from each department and college / division, met with the Deans about their unit’s FTE needs, and made recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor about new FTE allocations.
- Council reviewed several campus-specific proposals, including proposals to establish new centers and new degree programs.
- Council considered 16 requests for Academic search waivers (formerly, Exceptions to Open Recruitment) and one requests for an inter-departmental FTE transfer.
- Council reviewed five proposals to establish endowed chairs.
I. Overview

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) met for 20 regularly scheduled sessions (six in fall, six in winter, and eight in spring).

CPB’s agendas typically included the following items:

- Academic program reviews
- Review of campus issues (proposed centers, policies, procedures, reports, etc.)
- Review of systemwide issues (reports, proposals, etc.)
- Review of departmental and college / division FTE plans
- Consultations with Deans and other University administrators
- Requests for faculty recruitment Search Waivers
- Endowed chair proposals

II. Academic Program Reviews

CPB participated in the academic program review of five academic units:

1. Department of Chemical Engineering
2. Department of Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology (EEMB)
3. Media Arts & Technology Program (MATP)
4. Department of Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology (MCDB)
5. Writing Program

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by CPB’s respective area subcommittee: Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (MATP and Writing Program); Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences / Bren (EEMB and MCDB); and Engineering (Chemical Engineering and MATP). The Media Arts & Technology Program (MATP) is an interdisciplinary program, and was reviewed by both the HFA and Engineering Area Subcommittees. There were no academic program reviews in Social Sciences or Education. As per the review procedures, in fall quarter CPB studied the data notebooks and submitted a list of suggested questions to the Program Review Panel (PRP) for consideration by the respective External Review Committee (ERC). In winter quarter the CPB chair (or designate) attended a luncheon with the External Review Committee. In spring quarter, CPB reviewed each of the External Review Committee (ERC) reports and department responses and provided further comments to the Program Review Panel (PRP).

The Academic Senate was asked by the Executive Vice Chancellor to provide recommendations for the review for review by PRP in 2020-21. CPB’s recommendations were based on the length of time since the last review and consisted of: Economics, Linguistics, Philosophy, Chemistry & Biochemistry, and Computer Science. CPB also suggested that three programs be reviewed internally by the respective Dean (Medieval Studies, Renaissance Studies, and Military Science).

The five academic units that were ultimately chosen for review were:
Six units had previously been selected for review in 2019-20: Communication; Comparative Literature Program; French & Italian; Germanic & Slavic Studies; Mathematics; and Statistics & Applied Probability.

III. Academic Search Waivers and FTE Transfers

CPB reviewed 16 requests for search waivers from the following departments:

- Anthropology
- Asian American Studies
- Black Studies
- Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology (EEMB)
- Economics
- Education
- Electrical & Computer Engineering
- Feminist Studies
- Mechanical Engineering
- Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology (MCDB)
- Political Science
- Psychological & Brain Sciences
- Statistics & Applied Probability
- Theater & Dance

Of these, three were for partner hires, seven were to make an additional hire from an open search, three were for exceptional opportunities, and three were for Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows (PPFs). CPB followed the guidance of the Policy on Open Recruitment (*UCSB Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures, Section VII-1-III*) in making its recommendations to the EVC. CPB offered either a full or qualified endorsement in 15 cases and withheld support for one request.

In addition, CPB supported a joint request from Deans Wiltzius and Majewski (Divisions of MLPS and HFA, respectively) to transfer .50 FTE from the Department of History to the Environmental Studies Program. CPB endorsed the request with the understanding that the .50 FTE would revert from MLPS back to HFA upon the sitting professor’s retirement/separation.

IV. Review of Endowed Chair Proposals

In accordance with UCSB’s *Policy on Endowed Chairs* (Section VIII-11 of UCSB’s Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures, “Red Binder”), CPB was consulted on endowed chair proposals, regarding the appropriateness of the proposed subject areas and the conformity with the
academic mission of our campus. Council reviewed five endowed chair proposals and submitted final recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor via the Office of Academic Personnel. A new Policy on Endowed Chairs was adopted in September 2018 which increased the minimum endowment from $500,000 to $1 million. Several of this year’s endowed chair proposals were funded before the new policy was enacted.

1. **Corporate Environmental Management Endowed Chair:** The Corporate Environmental Management Chair in the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management will be endowed by a one-time gift of $1 million from a donor(s) who wishes to remain anonymous at this time. The Chair is intended to attract and support the work of an eminent faculty member researching in the field of Corporate Environmental Management.

2. **Duncan Chair in Actuarial Science:** The endowment amount of $500,000 fits with previous endowed chair policy but not with current endowed chair policy. The “Janet and Ian Duncan Actuarial Science Endowed Fund” was started with $50,000 in December 2015, and the balance of the gift was conveyed to UCSB, before the endowed chair threshold was raised to $1,000,000.

3. **Mehrabian Career Development Chairs:** These chairs will be endowed by a gift of $8,000,000 comprising six Mehrabian Career Development Chairs and five Mehrabian Chancellor’s Chairs. The two categories of chairs have different funding: the six Career Development chairs are to be assigned to assistant professors and are to carry an endowment of $500,000 apiece for a period of 3 years. The Chancellor’s Chairs are to go to senior faculty and are to carry an endowment of $1,000,000 apiece for a period of 5 years. The Mehrabian gift was made through stock transfers in August 2018, thus falling under the previous policy, in which $500,000 was the minimum gift.

4. **Mehrabian Presidential Chair in Engineering:** This Chair will be endowed by a one-time gift of $500,000 from Robert & Victoria Mehrabian, which will then be matched by the Mehrabian Presidential Chair Matching Fund, contributed by the Office of the President.

5. **Telemetering Chair:** This Chair will be endowed by a gifts totaling $500,000 from the Telemetering Foundation, with the hope that an additional $500,000 will be raised by UCSB. This endowment will support a faculty member in Engineering with “… the goals of advancing telemetry activities… and furthering the education and training of the next generation of telemetry professionals.”

In addition, CPB also received a joint request in January from Dean Wiltzius (MLPS) and Dean Gaines (Bren) to authorize a search for the Jack & Laura Dangermond Chair in Conservation Studies. In his cover memo, Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall noted, “Because of the timing of the chair establishment, and/or an apparent lack of communication with the Deans whose departments might house the new chair holder, neither Dean Wiltzius nor Dean Gaines requested permission to conduct a search for the chair in their 2018 FTE Plans.” The Council initially considered this issue in February and expressed concerns regarding the urgency of the request as well as the search strategy for recruiting into this position. In particular, the Council was concerned by the lack of letters of support from the potential home departments, and CPB wanted more information about their commitment to make an appointment. CPB received
additional information in spring quarter, which included support letters from the Departments of Geography and Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology as well as the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management. CPB was satisfied by the letters of support and endorsed this request.

V. Campus Issues

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2018-19 academic year.

FTE Planning

The Council on Planning & Budget was consulted by the Executive Vice Chancellor for its recommendations on academic positions (“FTEs” = Full-Time Equivalent appointments). The EVC’s call for academic FTE plans was sent to the Deans in November, and it included FTE templates that called for requested authorizations to recruit new faculty during the next three recruitment cycles (2019-22).

Departmental FTE plans were made available to CPB in winter quarter, and Deans’ FTE plans were provided in spring quarter as soon as they were available. CPB spent a great deal of time in winter and spring quarters consulting with Deans regarding their visions for their college / division. To the extent possible, CPB took into account additional information concerning separations, retirements, or other events that may have taken place since department plans were submitted at the end of February.

CPB subcommittees used the Deans’ recommendations as a guide for deliberations and referred to departmental plans when needed. CPB area subcommittees reported to the full CPB with their recommendations in late May and early June.

CPB provided the EVC with its final FTE recommendations in early July, which included feedback and considerations for future years.

Master of Environmental Data Science (MEDS)

In November, CPB reviewed the revised proposal for a Master of Environmental Data Science (MEDS). The original proposal was reviewed by CPB last year (December 2017). At the time, CPB supported the exploration of a data science program on campus, but Council did not endorse the proposal and offered a significant amount of feedback and identified several concerns. There were several aspects of the revised proposal that improved since the original, and overall, CPB was supportive of the revised proposal. However, some previous concerns raised by CPB remained in this second iteration. Many – but not all – of the issues from last year’s review were addressed in the revised proposal. Instead of requesting eight FTE, the revised proposal requested two (one ladder rank faculty and one LSOE). The new proposal also included a private donation of $3 million from an anonymous donor. However, CPB members expressed concerns about how the money would be used: exhausted in a few years for fellowships without being leveraged or used as an endowment for ongoing support. The revised proposal called for an enrollment of 80 students and 17 new courses, which CPB felt was an ambitious undertaking. Other concerns were whether the 11-month program was too short and also whether “Data
Analytics” would be a more appropriate name for the program instead of “Data Science.” A broader question for CPB was how this program would relate to other data science efforts and fit into the larger vision for data science on campus.

Then in January, CPB received a second revised proposal. CPB was more supportive of the MEDS proposal, felt that the bulk of its concerns were addressed, and believed it will bring significant visibility to campus and enhance the larger data science initiative. In reviewing the latest version of the proposal, three primary points were raised to be considered as factors to moving forward: 1.) What would happen if the MEDS program falls short of its stated goal of +/- 90 students? 2.) Although CPB was favorable toward the revised proposal, there still was not unanimous support of the rigor of the coursework, and 3.) The MEDs program will likely create numerous opportunities for collaboration across campus, with other universities, and with the larger community. This could present a good opportunity for faculty recruitment in the future.

Green Laboratories Action Plan

In April, CPB reviewed a draft of the Green Laboratories Action Plan. In general, the members of CPB were pleased with the available programs (e.g., LabRATS; LabSYNC assessments) and efforts UCSB has made toward making the campus sustainable (e.g., $3,000 assistance to researchers to replace old refrigerators with more energy efficient ones). Council offered some possible suggestions for continuing to improve the plan:

- Coordination of the Green Laboratories Action Plan with the Campus Sustainability Plan.
- Defining what constitutes a “laboratory”.
- Setting specific short-term goals and concentrate campus resources in supporting activities.
- Financing for energy efficient major equipment purchases.
- Benchmarking the green lab efforts at UCSB to the other UCs to assess best practices.

Library Reorganization Proposal

In May, CPB reviewed an informational memo from Senate Chair Henning Bohn along with University Librarian Kristin Antelman’s description of organizational changes to the UCSB Library. CPB expressed concerns that the shift in positions would not ensure the informed communication and response that subject librarians provide to their constituencies, as specialists themselves, in specific areas of research, but would reallocate their skills to serve more general library usage. It is this shift from specialized knowledge holders to coordinators as it applies to subject librarians and discipline specific knowledge that is of concern to academic researchers.

CPB recognized the need for organizational changes that would keep our library in sync with the changing nature of knowledge production and the shifting landscape of publication, and appreciated the carefully laid out plan for implementing some necessary changes. CPB also recognized that these changes will affect different Divisions and disciplines on our campus in different ways. CPB therefore acknowledged faculty concerns regarding the impact of such deep changes on their disciplines and specialized areas of research.
CPB urged UL Antelman to connect directly with departments within impacted disciplines and Divisions to discuss their specific needs and the ways that the library reorganization will affect them. These conversations should be in the spirit of true consultation, open to suggestions and realignments based on faculty needs and feedback to the proposed changes, thereby insuring the continuation of the library’s critical role in the research excellence of all academics on our campus.

In July, University Library Antelman issued a memo acknowledging the Academic Senate’s feedback and stating her decision to not proceed this year “… with any changes related to collection management responsibilities, including both the librarians in the Collection Management Department and subject liaison librarians who perform collection-related duties for their departments. All changes related to collection management are on hold pending further consultation with academic departments and the recruitment of a Director of Collection Strategy to replace a retiring Department Head, Eunice Schroeder.”

Open Access Initiative

In November, CPB reviewed the OA2020: Open Access Initiative. CPB strongly supported signing the open access (OA) initiative. The Council agreed with the importance of the initiative and the need to move forward toward a viable, international solution for OA. CPB also encouraged further investigation into finding a sustainable business plan to allow more Open Access.

Campus Sustainability Plan

In November and then again in March, CPB reviewed the draft of the campus sustainability plan. During the first review, members of CPB expressed satisfaction with the available programs and efforts UCSB has made toward making the campus sustainable. Council offered some suggestions for continuing to improve this plan, with the most important point being the inclusion of a budget and prioritization of the proposed plans.

In reviewing the revised draft in March, CPB expressed support for the efforts of the Chancellor’s Sustainability Committee to move the campus forward and help UCSB become a leader in sustainability. The Council appreciated the responses to prior comments and the detailed matrix laying out the top goals under each area of the plan and its current funding sources. CPB suggested that campus sustainability efforts should include a strategic plan with an analysis of costs and benefits as well as a plan outlining funding sources and overall financial responsibility. CPB expressed eagerness to participate in future discussions about campus priorities once a detailed budget and cost-benefit analysis are available.

Other Issues

There were two local issues on which CPB chose not opine:

1. Draft UCSB Electronic Communication Policy
2. Recommendations for the Use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements for Academic Positions at UC
VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2018-19 term:

Systemwide Mexico Entities Current State Assessment Report

In October, CPB reviewed the systemwide Mexico Entities current state assessment report. CPB fully supported the idea that the three Mexico entities should be merged into one program, given the current financial situation. There were four primary points of discussion surrounding this issue.

1) While it was clear that all three programs are facing financial difficulties, there are also several elements that cross all of the programs, making the integration of them a logical move. The merge will result in a leaner entity that will make a more efficient use of whatever budget the program receives.

2) There was a lack of consensus on where the final program should be hosted. The decision regarding the location of the new entity is not as well articulated and defended in the report as is the argument for merging the programs. But, most CPB members favored having the new entity reside at one of the UC campuses.

3) The financial future of the program is uncertain even with a merger. Going forward, creative thinking about funding is necessary for the program to function effectively. Restructuring of roles is required in order for the new entity to be cost effective.

4) Some CPB members wished UCSB played a larger role in this program. Even though UCSB is involved, it is not as engaged as other UC campuses according to the pie charts presented in the report, which show UCSB on the low end by most measures.

Principles of Accountability with Respect to Financial Transactions

In November, CPB reviewed the proposed Presidential Policy on the Principles of Accountability with Respect to Financial Transactions. Overall, CPB found the proposed policy reasonable. CPB noted the difficulty in assessing the policy without detailed past experiences directly dealing with administrative financial matters. CPB agreed with the basic points that no one person should have complete oversight of the financial transactions that occur in a department and all transactions must be accounted for and appropriately recorded.

CPB members expressed concern that the changes may mean that more financial responsibility and liability would be pushed down to departments and financial managers, but CPB was reassured that the proposed policy does not make any substantive changes vis-à-vis locus of financial responsibility. With the understanding that the document is a codification of existing practice, CPB had no objections to the proposed policy.

Policy on Sexual Violence & Sexual Harassment

In November, CPB reviewed the revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence & Sexual Harassment. Overall, CPB found the proposed revisions appropriate. While noting several suggested edits, CPB had no objections to the policy revisions.
CPB continued to express some concerns that the policy appeared to prioritize mediation as the first recommended course of action under the section on Alternative Resolution (section V.A.5.a.), and suggested that mediation be moved further down the list of available options. CPB also questioned what is meant by a “reasonable person” as used throughout the document.

UC Center Sacramento Assessment Report

In May, CPB reviewed the assessment report on the UC Center Sacramento. CPB agreed that the Center is serving a valuable service to the students who participate, particularly those interested in California politics and working in state government. Additionally, the Center appeared to CPB to have a positive relationship with the Davis campus, which houses the administration for the program. CPB supported the overall vision of the program and what it sought to accomplish. While there was some concern about a projected budget deficit, CPB believed that the report addressed suggested solutions to deal with the problem.

Other Issues

There were three systemwide issues on which CPB chose not to opine:
1. UC Transfer Guarantee Proposal
2. University Committee on Privilege & Tenure’s proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336
3. Report from the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate on Faculty Discipline, Sexual violence, Assault, and Harassment

VII. Committees

The Council has three standing committees:
- Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
- Committee on Development & Community Relations
- Committee on Capital & Space Planning

Committee business was conducted primarily by email. Issues were delegated to the appropriate committees for prior review, and recommendations were then forwarded to the full Council for deliberation.

The principal issues under review by CPB were spearheaded by CAPRA. These included systemwide reports and reviews, as well as many of the local issues under review. The Committee on Development & Community Relations conducted a preliminary review of endowed chair proposals.

The Council also continued a tradition of four ad hoc “area subcommittees,” based on colleges and divisions:
- Social Sciences and Education
- MLPS and Bren
- HFA and Creative Studies
- Engineering
The area subcommittees primarily were tasked with conducting preliminary analyses of the academic program reviews. In addition, Academic search waiver requests were first sent to the respective area subcommittee for initial consideration and a recommendation to the full Council. Finally, the subcommittees took the lead in developing the respective parts of the overall FTE recommendations for 2019-21, presenting recommendations for full Council discussion.

VIII. Council Representation

The Council Chair served as a member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, as Vice Chair of the Campus Planning Committee, as a member of the Chancellor’s Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy, and as a member of the Risk Assessment/ Audit Committee. The CPB chair along with the chair of the Committee on Development & Community Relations served as Trustees of the UCSB Foundation.

IX. CPB Relationship with University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB)

CPB Chair served as the UCSB representative on UCPB and regularly reported on UCPB business conducted at the monthly meetings in Oakland, soliciting comments from council members on pending UCPB issues.

X. Coordination with the Administration

The Council on Planning & Budget consulted with several members of the Administration during the 2018-19 term, including: the Executive Vice Chancellor; Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning; Director of Capital Development; Associate Vice Chancellor for Development; the Deans of the College of Letters & Science; Dean of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; Dean of the College of Creative Studies; Dean of the Bren School for Environmental Science & Management; and Dean of the College of Engineering.

The Council Chair and Vice Chair held regular (monthly) consultations with EVC David Marshall. These meetings provided an opportunity to discuss issues and concerns informally and play an effective role in shared governance.

The Council engaged in several informative discussions with Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning Chuck Haines. A list of questions were developed in advance of his meetings to help facilitate the discussions. The conversations addressed a number of budget-related issues: budget overview of the campus; income & expenditures; new initiatives; research; unfunded mandates; undergraduate enrollment surge; and staff support.

Capital Planning

The CPB Chair served as a Vice Chair of the Campus Planning Committee (CPC), which reviewed or discussed several issues and campus projects. A 10-Year Capital Financial Plan has not been reviewed by CPB in several years, although Capital projects presentations by the Deans were made to CPC over the past year. CPB was informed that the Council will be asked to participate in a campus capital projects prioritization process in the coming year (2019-20).
In April, CPB sent a memo to Senate Chair Henning Bohn reiterating interest in receiving a copy of the report on the external review of Design & Construction Services. The Council had been made aware of the review during the 2017-18 year, and CPB expressed interest in receiving a copy of the report and commenting on it. CPB’s request was forwarded to Garry Mac Pherson, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services. The Vice Chancellor responded in May with a copy of the report. It was decided that the report would be carried over for CPB review in 2019-20.

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Issues that CPB and UCPB should expect to revisit in the coming year include the following:

- Accounting of FTEs and Deans’ discretionary budgets
- UCSB Budget transparency
- Campus-wide academic strategic plan
- Campus-wide Capital Planning priorities
- Campus facilities and deferred maintenance
- State-mandated enrollment surge
- Academic versus non-academic budget growth

Council Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position / Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joao Hespanha</td>
<td>Chair / UCPB rep Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara (Tammy) Afifi</td>
<td>Vice Chair Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Carlson</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Derwin</td>
<td>Germanic &amp; Slavic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Friedkin</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Gable</td>
<td>Psychological &amp; Brain Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostas Goulias</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobias Hollerer</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sreenivasa Rao</td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Applied Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jammalamadaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Jimerson</td>
<td>Counseling, Clinical, &amp; School Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuha Khoury</td>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal L. Martin</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Moehlis</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Moskovits</td>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newfield</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Steigerwald</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subhash Suri</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Taves</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Academic Senate invited participation of representatives from Associated Students and the Graduate Students Association but did not receive replies. CPB believes student representation is very important in senate councils and committees. CPB will intensify its efforts to recruit representatives from these bodies in the future.
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

**Executive Summary**

Per bylaw 65, the purpose of the Council on Research and Instructional Resources (CRIR) is to promote an optimal research and educational environment, to manage Senate resources and provide advice in a manner that fosters quality and diversity of research and instructional programs.

Highlights:

- Bylaw 65 has been amended to reflect the creation of the Committee on Information Technology, a third standing committee under CRIR, beginning in Fall 2019.
- The UC has discontinued its relationship with Elsevier publishing after an unsuccessful contract renewal process. The library is working on mitigation strategies to avoid disruptions to research.
- The Committee on Faculty Grants awarded $938,800 to 82 proposals out of 92 submitted for the Faculty Research Grant and $69,673 to seven proposals for the Pearl Chase Research Grant.

**Council and Committee Meetings**

Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP) and Committee on Library, Information, and Instructional Resources (CLIIR) met eight and six times, respectively, during the 2018-19 academic year, and CRIR met once as a full council once in Winter 2019.

The Committee on Faculty Grants (FG) met three times during Spring 2019; all CRIR members were obliged to participate as part of their CRIR service, with some additional members added by Committee on Committees to balance divisional representation.

**System-Wide Issues and Reviews**

All system-wide issues that CRIR responded to are listed below. Issues that CRIR reviewed but chose not to opine on are not included.

**Research Grants Program Office – Current State Assessment Report**

CRPP reviewed the RGPO Current State Assessment Report and made recommendations including increased Senate oversight of the office; improved clarity in MRU oversight; prioritization of the MRPI program for funding; and additional involvement of faculty in RGPO leadership.

**Current State Assessment Report for Systemwide Mexico Entities**

CRPP recommended expanded faculty consultation on the proposal to merge UC’s three Mexico entities into one. Members felt they did not receive adequate time for review and therefore could not endorse the proposal.

**Composite Benefit Rates (CBR) for Postdocs**

CRPP consulted with Assistant Chancellor (AC) Haines regarding a recent change in the use of composite benefit rates for postdocs. Benefits were previously calculated on an actual cost basis, which better allowed for individual variances. AC Haines worked closely with the Office of Research to get the new rates as close to actual as possible, which has resulted in a set of 10 rates, 2 of which are campus specific. Some employees are disadvantaged by the new method, while others
receive slight advantages. Although there will be a long-term advantage for the campus, it is anticipated that we have at least five years of mitigation issues to address. A campus workgroup, including 3 CRPP representatives, is now studying the issue and will continue to do so in the following year. This was subsequently taken up by UCORP as a system-wide issue with the following suggestions for mitigation:

1. Any composite benefit rate charge to existing research grants should not decrease direct funding for research;
2. Create a method to reach investigators unknowingly affected by CBR implementation.

Revision of BFP-RMP-7 - Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information
CRPP reviewed BFP-RMP-7 on behalf of the Santa Barbara Division. The committee supported a policy for protecting personally identifiable information (PII). Members made suggestions for several clarifications pertaining to how PII is defined, as well as the Rules of Conduct and the responsibilities of employees.

Concerns Regarding the Use of Research Information Management Systems
CLIIR members reviewed the RIMS documents and affirmed the efforts of the Academic Council to gather data and understand the landscape of RIMS use within the UC quickly. Members discussed the potential impact on the merit process and the potential for different needs/uses of these systems by program. Members shared concern that campuses weren’t more forthcoming about their utilization of these systems. Additionally, there were concerns about whether these systems are too quantitative in focus, as well as the risks of third party vendors controlling personnel data.

Local Business

Draft Campus Sustainability Plan
CRPP was overall supportive of the draft campus sustainability plan. Members felt the initial plan lacked a clear definition of its scope, but they were satisfied with the revised plan.

Proposal to Establish Master of Environmental Data Science (MEDS)
CRPP members reviewed a revised proposal for the MEDS degree program in Fall 2018. They expressed concerns about the proposed plan to have students attend classes both on campus and at the NCEAS facility in downtown Santa Barbara, but ultimately were supportive of the proposed degree program. CLIIR’s primary concerns about the proposal focused on impacts to the library, including needs for data curation, staff, teaching, collaborating, and consulting on projects; however, CLIIR was assured by UCSB Librarian Antelman that these resources are already being planned for by the library. The proposal was approved by the Faculty Legislature on April 18, 2019.

Proposal to Establish Senate Committee dedicated to IT Governance – Revision to Bylaw 65
Chair Su proposed the establishment of a Senate Committee, Committee on Information Technology (CIT), as a new standing committee of CRIR. This committee would be comprised of a Chair and 5 faculty members, 2 of whom would serve on the IT council, one as the systemwide UCACC representative, and the campus CIO would serve as ex-officio. This committee’s charge would be to deal with IT issues related to faculty and current campus infrastructure. There has been a Cyber Security Work Group run under the Council for Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards, but that group’s operations concluded in 2019 with the rollout of the implementation of the revised Electronic Communications Policy. This change was approved by CRIR members at the Council meeting on February 8, 2019. The proposal was approved by the Faculty Legislature at the March 21, 2019 meeting.

Neuroscience Research Institute (NRI) ORU Review
CRPP reviewed materials from the Office of Research (OR) on its review of NRI including: the NRI self-assessment, external review committee (ERC) report, (co)-directors' response, as well as steering committee chair's response to the ERC report. CRPP’s review found the NRI to be a well-organized, functional research organization.
Green Labs Action Plan v6
CLIIR members reviewed the Green Labs Action Plan. They raised questions as to whether aspects of the plan were still in need of funding and how the plan would progress if some aspects were not funded, as well as the impacts to overhead for research grants. They recommended the creation of “best practices” for implementation for individual labs.

Library Updates

OA2020
CRPP joined CLIIR (and eight other senate councils/committees) in support of UCSB’s signing of the OA2020 Expression of Interest, the international initiative to accelerate the transition of traditional subscription publications to open access.

Elsevier Publishing Contract
The University’s contract with Elsevier publishing expired on December 31, 2018. The understanding was that all Elsevier content available prior to the contract termination would remain accessible, and the UC librarians undertook plans to mitigate issues related to the loss of access to new Elsevier content. UC ended the negotiation without a contract on February 28, 2019 and direct access to 2019 Elsevier articles (and some older journal articles) is now being discontinued by Elsevier; this is a complex process that is ongoing.

Open Access/Journal Offsetting Agreements
UCSB Librarian Antelman presented CLIIR with an Open Access Fund proposal. The OA Fund is supported and administered by the UCSB Library to cover the cost of article publishing charges in open access journals so that no UCSB author is disadvantaged by the lack of funds to help cover relevant publication fees. The Fund will be assessed annually for effectiveness, fairness, and sustainability. CLIIR members offered suggested revisions to the initial plan including: making the funds accessible to students; adding conference papers for consideration; reimbursing the full publishing fee (the average is $1600). Funds will only be available to fully open access and the FAQ section of the application will be expanded to explain limitations on hybrid models. Funds will be set aside from the acquisitions budget.

Library Reorganization
Librarian Antelman presented CLIIR with a revised organizational chart for the library in Winter 2019. Two new units, Outreach & Engagement and Teaching & Learning, will be established under the Division of Learning & Engagement. Additionally, a Division of Digital Library & Information Technology will oversee IT & Library Systems, Digital Library, Data Curation, and Interdisciplinary Research Collaboratory units. She dispelled rumors that any Subject Librarians were losing their position.

However, the planned reorganization of the Subject Librarian staff and elimination of the Reference desk proved controversial across campus in Spring 2019. CLIIR members were divided on endorsing a letter which proposed a one-year moratorium on the reorganization. Librarian Antelman subsequently undertook to begin a series of consultative meetings with various departments and councils in order to understand and respond to perceived impacts of the reorganization across campus.

Faculty Grants

Policy and Procedures Updates
CRPP discussed whether the grants policy should be revised to allow funds to be used for faculty summer salaries. It was agreed that it would not be a good idea to fund summer salary, but that the language regarding computers should be modified to convey that consideration will be given to well-reasoned requests for computing facilities that are explicitly needed to conduct research on the
CRPP discussed whether faculty should be allowed to submit two independent proposals during the same grant cycle, one for the Faculty Research Grant (FRG) and one to the Pearl Chase Research Grant (PCRG). It was agreed that faculty could submit proposals to both grants within a single cycle, but that only one proposal would be accepted per faculty member.

**Summary of Grant Applications and Awards**

The Senate FRG budget allocation for the 2018-2019 cycle was $960,000 and the PCRG budget allocation was $84,000. During this cycle, 92 completed applications were submitted and reviewed for the Faculty Research Grants; 82 of the proposals were fully or partially funded.

Although only two proposals were initially submitted for the PCRG, the review committee identified five additional proposals that had been submitted to the FRG pool but met the eligibility criteria for the PCRG. Therefore, a total of seven proposals were funded through the PCRG during the 2018-2019 review cycle. Six of seven proposals were fully funded, one partially funded. The total amount of PCRG funds awarded was $69,673.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>$81,707</td>
<td>$50,917.00</td>
<td>62.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>$145,597.65</td>
<td>$100,426</td>
<td>68.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td>$311,312.77</td>
<td>$216,457</td>
<td>69.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>$467,529.89</td>
<td>$396,646</td>
<td>84.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>$192,098.78</td>
<td>$174,354</td>
<td>90.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,198,246.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>$938,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.35%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Membership (Organized by Committee)

Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP)

Bridget L. Coggins
Lisa Jevbratt
Arturo A. Keller
Heejung Kim
Wendy Meiring
Harry N. Nelson, UCORP Representative
Wim van Dam
Joseph R. Incandela, Ex Officio
Jennifer A. Smith, Non-Senate Academic Rep
Jianwen Su, Chair of CRIR and CRPP, UCACC Rep

Committee on Library, Information and Instructional Resources (CLIIR)

Paul M. Berkowitz
Forrest Brewer
Wolf D. Kittler
Miriam Wattles
René Weber, UCOLASC Rep
Liming Zhang
Kristin A. Antelman, Ex Officio
George Michaels, Consultant
Rebecca R. Greer, Non-Senate Academic Rep
Magda Campo, Non-Senate Academic Rep
Werner Kuhn, Vice Chair of CRIR, Chair of CLIIR

Committee on Faculty Grants (FG)

Isabel Bayrakdarian
Paul M. Berkowitz
Forrest Brewer
Bridget L. Coggins
Erik Eyster
Lisa Jevbratt
Arturo A. Keller
Heejung Kim
Rachael S. King
Wolf D. Kittler
Xiaorong Li
Wendy Meiring
Greg Siegel
Miriam Wattles
Hannah L. Wohl
Liming Zhang
Werner Kuhn, Co-Chair
Jianwen Su, Co-Chair

Raphael Chinchilla, GSA Rep
Casey Hankey, Advisor
Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Executive Committee Annual Report: 2018-2019

According to Academic Senate Divisional Bylaws and Regulations, the Executive Committee of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education is a committee of the Academic Senate authorized as an organization through which the Faculty of the School can coordinate the academic affairs of the School. The Committee reports to, and is responsible to, the Academic Senate and its officers. The Executive Committee is distinguished from Administrative Committees that are created by the Administration and are responsible to, and report to, Administrative Officers.

2018-2019 Members
Andrew Fedders, Chair – GGSE Credential Leadership Committee Representative, Department of Education
Tim Dewar – Teacher Education Representative
Laura Romo – Department of Education Representative
Andrew Maul – Department of Education Representative
Ty Vernon – Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Representative
Chunyan Yang – Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Representative
Victoria “Tory” Harvey – Non-Senate Faculty Representative (Teacher Education Program)
Shane Jimerson – Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology Representative
Emily Benstein, Student Representative - Department of Education
Ida Taghavi, Student Representative - Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology
Jeff Milem, Dean
Aaron Ballett, Advisor
Briana Villasenor, Advisor

Executive Summary
The Faculty Executive Committee met eight times during the 18-19 academic year and addressed policy matters, curricular and academic matters, and Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE) matters presented by the Academic Senate and members of the GGSE.

Policy Matters:
- Proposed Revision of Presidential Policy Regarding Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
  - The FEC expressed concern that more clarity is needed specifying employee’s mandatory reporter responsibilities if they are also a student and peer
- Open Access 2020
  - The FEC encourages the campus to sign on to the OA2020 Expression of Interest
- Open Access Policy for Theses and Dissertations – second round review
  - The FEC supports adoption of the revised policy
- Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Bylaw 336
  - The FEC appreciates the efforts of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and support the revisions
• OISS Implementation of Hard Registration Blocks
  o The FEC voted to approve the use of hard registration blocks by OISS
• Revision of Divisional Regulation 25
  o The FEC supports the revision
• Request for Departmental Name Change in Division of Student Affairs
  o The FEC supports the proposed name change
• EVC Request for Advice regarding Departments for 2020-21 Review
  o The FEC recommends review of any departments or academic units that have not been reviewed in 10 or more years
• Student Conduct – Degree Clearance Proposal
  o The FEC supports the recommendation of the registrar to ensure student compliance with Code of Conduct
• UC Center Sacramento
  o The FEC appreciates the work put into the report and feels UCCS positions the UC for the future
• Library Organizational Changes
  o The FEC does not take any issue with the Library organizational changes

Curricular and Academic Matters:
• Changes to ED Courses
  o The FEC discussed and endorses the proposed changes to courses in the Department of Education
• Supercourse Challenges and Recommendations
  o The FEC discussed and endorses the recommendation
• Changes to Applied Psych Minor
  o The FEC discussed and endorsed the proposed changes to the Applied Psychology Minor
• TEP M.Ed Changes
  o The FEC discussed and endorsed the recommendation to remove the requirement of the second summer in the M.Ed program

GGSE Matters:
• Syllabi Statements for GGSE
  o In the 2017-18 school year the FEC worked to draft school wide language to be used in all syllabi. After further review, discussion, and vetting with other campus offices, the FEC voted to adopt the language and use it in all syllabi
• ESCI
  o There have been repeated critiques that ESCI scores and reflect implicit bias against racial minorities and women. In an effort to explore alternatives, the FEC has been reading and discussing research pertaining to teacher evaluation, other efforts on
campus to find alternatives/additions to the ESCI. This work is ongoing and will be explored more fully in the next academic year.

- GGSE Diversity Statement
  - The FEC discussed the proposed Diversity Statement drafted by the GGSE Committee on Diversity, and Equity. The FEC voted to approve the statement.

- GGSE Workload Policy
  - The FEC reviewed and discussed the proposed GGSE Workload Policy submitted by the GGSE Leadership Committee.
Graduate Council
Annual Report 2018-19

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Graduate Council met for thirteen regularly scheduled two-hour sessions during the 2018-19 term.

Executive Summary
The Graduate Council’s purpose is to set standards for and policy on graduate education; to ensure the viability and quality of graduate programs; and to provide advice and consent on all matters of policy, planning, programs and practice that impact the quality and diversity of UCSB’s graduate students and their educational experience.

The Graduate Council discussed and took action on a variety of key issues during the 2018-19 term, among them:
- Approving the establishment of a Master of Environmental Data Science degree in the Bren School.
- Crafting draft faculty graduate student mentor guidelines.
- Approving the allowance of departments to opt out of requiring the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) for graduate admissions.
- Commenting on various divisional and systemwide draft policy documents including: a proposed revision of Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment; review of proposed new APM 011; a proposal for a name change of the B.A. and B.S. in Statistical Science to Statistics and Data Science; a review and decision regarding cotutelle programs; a Student Conduct-Degree Clearance proposal; a proposal for Library Organizational Changes; and the UCSF - Dignity Health affiliation.

I. Graduate Course Requests
Graduate Council authorizes, supervises, and regulates all graduate courses except such courses exempted by action of the Regents. During the period between 7/1/2018 and 6/30/2019, Council processed a total of 248 course requests, including new courses, modifications, and discontinuations.

II. Review of Academic Programs and Research Units
In cooperation with the Program Review Panel, Graduate Council participated in the Academic Program Review of the following departments and programs during the 2018-19 term: Chemical Engineering, Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology, Media Arts and Technology Program, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology, and Writing Program.

Graduate Council recommended five departments and one program for Academic Program Review in 2020-21.

III. Proposals to Establish Programs, Emphases, Academic Units and Research Units
- Considered, sent questions back to the initiators, and ultimately approved the establishment of the Master of Environmental Data Science degree in the Bren School.
- Reviewed a proposal to establish an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Climate Science, and sent comments back to the initiators.
IV. **Name Changes**
Graduate Council did not receive any graduate program name change proposals for 2018-19.

V. **Changes to Existing Programs**
- Approved revisions to the Department of Materials M.S. Plan II degree.
- Approved course changes for the Teacher Education Program curriculum.
- Approved changes to the Program Learning Outcomes for the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry.
- Approved curricular changes for the Ph.D. in Economics.
- Approved a curricular course substitution for the Master of Technology Management.
- Approved a curricular change to the graduate programs in the Department of Religious Studies.
- Clarified the Department of Counseling, Clinical & School Psychology – Counseling Psychology Specialization Ph.D. requirements.
- Approved a grading option change to core courses in the Department of Classics Ph.D. program.
- Approved the proposed changes to the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Demography.
- Approved Program Learning Outcomes for the graduate programs in Media Arts and Technology.
- Approved the addition of the Comparative Literature Program to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Cognitive Science.
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the Department of Anthropology – Archaeology M.A. comprehensive examination.
- Approved the proposed changes to the degree requirements for the Department of Linguistics graduate programs.
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the Department of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology – Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Specialization.
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to M.A. in History.
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering.
- Approved the proposed changes to the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Neuroengineering.
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Dynamical Neuroscience.
- Approved proposed changes to the requirements of the Master of Education degree.
- Approved Program Learning Outcomes for the Ph.D. program in Global Studies.
- Approved the addition of the Department of Music – Ethnomusicology to the participating units of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Global Studies.
- Approved the proposed curricular changes to the graduate programs in the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies.
- Approved changes to the Department of Feminist Studies qualifying examinations.
- Approved the proposed changes to the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Bioengineering.

VI. **Student Petitions**
Graduate Council did not receive any student petitions for 2018-19.

VII. **Local Business**

**GRAD Course Code**
Graduate Council reviewed a proposal from the Graduate Division to continue to use the 200-level designation, where appropriate, for courses offered under the GRAD course code designation. GRAD courses were originally approved to be offered as 500-level, however, the one course offered so far was
designated GRAD 210. The course has been successful and GC agreed that GRAD courses should continue to be offered as 200-level.

OISS Proposal to Implement Hard Registration Blocks to Enforce Compliance with the U.S. Federal Registrar and Homeland Security
Graduate Council discussed a proposal from the Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS) to allow use of registration hard blocks for international students who do not respond to inquiries for required information. OISS is mandated by the Department of Homeland Security to enter certain criteria into the Student and Exchange Visitor System (SEVIS) database. Local addresses and confirmation of full-time enrollment must be verified within a 30-day deadline or students are considered “out-of-status”. If this occurs, students must be reinstated though the U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services. Members discussed the implications of using a hard block, but ultimately felt that it would be an effective tool to get students to comply with federally mandated law and voted unanimously to endorse the proposal.

OA2020 – Letter from UCSB Librarian Kristin Antelman
Graduate Council discussed a letter from UCSB Krisin Antelman regarding the Max Plank Library OA2020 international initiative towards open access. Six UC campuses had already signed the OA2020 Expression of Interest, and Librarian Antelman and the Committee on Library, Information and Instructional Resources was asking for UCSB to give its support. GC voted unanimously to endorse the proposal.

Updates to the University Formatting Requirements for Thesis/Dissertation/DMA Supporting Documents
Graduate Council reviewed a proposal from Graduate Division for updates to the Guide to Formatting & Filing Theses and Dissertations. Proposed changes would allow students to use their legal first name or preferred first name; middle initial in lieu of middle name; and would remove the requirement for Music Compositions that compositions have a different pagination. GC voted unanimously to approve these changes.

Supercourse Challenges and Recommendations
Graduate Council reviewed the Supercourse Challenges and Recommendations documents. Members agreed that supercourses are mainly used at the undergraduate level, and more information needs to be provided about how any changes would affect graduate courses. A majority of the issues seem to stem from miscommunication and staff turnover/lack of training. GC decided not to opine on the issue.

Name Change of the B.A. and B.S. Statistical Science to Statistics and Data Science
Graduate Council discussed the proposal for the name change of the B.A. and B.S. in Statistical Science to Statistics and Data Science. Members raised questions about the comprehensiveness of the proposal as well as its integration and relationship with other data science initiatives on campus. Other questions pertained to how this major will differ from the potential future undergraduate major in Data Science, and if there will be any proposed changes to graduate degree names. Some members were quite supportive and applauded the initiative taken by the department to address an important area of study and to provide the necessary courses that many students are demanding. GC sent forward a memo with their questions and concerns.

Revision of Divisional Regulation 25 in response to concerns raised by the Office for Civil Rights
Graduate Council discussed the revised changes to Divisional Regulation 25 (Appendix V) pertaining to student grade appeals. While members approved of the changes, they wished to see a flow chart
created that outlines the grade appeal process in order for students to have better guidance on how to proceed with the various steps outlined in the policy. A memo with this suggestion was sent forward.

Request for Department Name Change in the Division of Student Affairs – Office of Judicial Affairs
Graduate Council reviewed the proposal from the Office of Judicial Affairs, requesting a name change to the Office of Student Conduct. This would bring the office’s name in line with its sister departments at most other UC campuses. GC voted unanimously to endorse this proposal.

Request to Allow Departments to Opt Out of the GRE for Graduate Admissions
Graduate Council reviewed a proposal from Graduate Division to allow departments to opt out of requiring the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) for graduate admissions. The GRE is currently required for all graduate programs at UCSB except the Master of Fine Arts and some 5-year programs. Graduate Division has received requests for individual exceptions to the GRE requirement, which have all been denied.

GC discussed the data provided regarding potential bias in the GRE, and that many colleges and universities (including seven of the UC campuses) no longer require the test. Members unanimously voted to allow departments to determine if they want to opt out of requiring the GRE, beginning with the 2020 admissions cycle.

Request for Review of Cotutelle Programs
Graduate Council discussed a request from Graduate Division to review cotutelle programs. These are ad hoc agreements between two universities (one being international) and can take the form of joint degrees or dual degrees. Graduate Division has received requests from interested students and faculty, but there is no UC-wide policy allowing or disallowing cotutelles, and UCSB does not have a local policy.

GC discussed three options and voted on each one: to allow students to enter into cotutelle agreements leading to joint degrees; to allow students to enter into cotutelle agreements leading to dual degrees; or to disallow all cotutelle agreements. Members unanimously voted to disallow all cotutelle programs.

Draft UCSB Green Labs Action Plan V6
Graduate Council reviewed the draft UCSB Green Labs Action Plan document. Members had a variety of questions and comments they sent forward, including the goal of the report, where the funding for projects would come from, what incentives are for faculty and students to participate in programs, and how these projects interact with UCSB’s deferred maintenance obligations.

Student Conduct-Degree Clearance Proposal
Graduate Council discussed the proposal to require that students be in compliance with the Student Code of Conduct in order to have their degree conferred. Members were concerned that students would now be “guilty until proven innocent”, and if withholding a degree from a student who has not been found guilty of any student conduct violation is the most appropriate course of action. The proposal was also not very precise and discussed various issues that did not seem directly pertinent to the issue at hand. GC sent forward a memo with their concerns and recommended a proposal with more careful presentation and wording.

Nominations for Program Review Panel
Graduate Council submitted the names of thirteen Senate faculty members to the Committee on Committees for consideration for service on the Program Review Panel (PRP) beginning in 2019-20.
Library Organizational Changes
Graduate Council reviewed a summary of proposed organizational changes to the UCSB Library, and met with Library Kristin Antelman. Members had strong reservations about some aspects of the reorganization, especially the restructuring of some of the subject librarian’s duties. Members also posed concerns around loss of resources for faculty and graduate students, how non-critical collections will be maintained, the seeming preference to fund digital materials over monographs, and a lack of standing orders for departments. GC was most troubled by the fact that department consultation did not take place. Members agreed to send forward a memorandum with their main concerns, as well as a statement that consultation with departments is absolutely required before significant reorganization can take place.

Draft Electronic Communication Policy (ECP)
Graduate Council reviewed the draft Electronic Communication Policy. Section III: F: 1: b states that if faculty electronic communications are requested to be accessed without consent, the Executive Vice Chancellor will “obtain the written advice of the Academic Senate” prior to approving the request. GC asked to clarify who in the Academic Senate is to be consulted and is to provide written consent.

Faculty Graduate Student Mentoring Guidelines
In February, GC began a discussion about faculty mentoring guidelines. The three-member subcommittee led a discussion about the draft mentoring document they compiled. They reviewed other campuses’ adopted guidelines and some UCSB documents, and decided to adapt UC Berkeley’s guidelines. The subcommittee’s goal was a document of best practices, not policy.

Over the next meetings, GC had in-depth discussions about the mentoring guidelines and the role of faculty mentoring in general. Areas of discussion included:

- Including points about respecting the time and culture of each student and addressing barriers to student learning.
- The role mentors have in directing students to appropriate resources.
- The responsibilities that students have as mentees, but also the asymmetric relationship between mentors and mentees.
- Poor mentor-mentee matches and current dissatisfaction of many graduate students with their mentoring experience.
- Mentoring is evolving, and there are mentoring differences between disciplines.

Chair El Abbadi and Vice Chair Lunsford met with Senate Chair Bohn to discuss the draft graduate mentoring guidelines. Chair Bohn suggested structuring the document so that the more “common sense” ground rules for mentoring were at the beginning of the document, and removing strong language to avoid the document being seen as rules faculty need to follow. The subcommittee took all feedback into account and prepared a final draft in April.

GC then discussed how they could distribute the guidelines for a preliminary review. The document was sent to the Graduate Student Association Executive Committee for feedback. The GSA Executives had many concerns, and want a document that is written jointly between Graduate Council and the GSA. However, these are supposed to be “best practices” written by faculty for faculty. GSA will work on their own student-centered mentoring document.
GC did not have enough time at the end of the academic year to distribute the guidelines to other Senate councils and committees, or department chairs. The 2019-20 Graduate Council will need to determine how to move forward.

VIII. Systemwide Business

Current State Assessment Report for Systemwide Mexico Entities
Graduate Council discussed the Current State Assessment Report for Systemwide Mexico Entities, regarding UC Mexus, the UC-Mexico Initiative, and Casa de California. While GC understood some of the reasoning behind the proposed merger, elimination of redundancies, and the budgetary realities, members had concerns around reduced funding for graduate students, how the academic program changes would impact graduate students and faculty, reasons why some of those interviewed opposed the proposal, and that there was no discussion about reaching out to successful graduates who participated in UC Mexus. GC sent forward a memo with their comments.

Proposed Revision of Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
Graduate Council discussed the Proposed Revision of Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment. Graduate Council agreed to send along comments pertaining to the following concerns:
- It was not clear in what capacity graduate students must act as mandated reporters. The language in II-7: Responsible Employee should be much more specific regarding when graduate students are “acting in their capacities as employees”.
- Concern that the Title IX Officer can proceed with an investigation even if a Complainant requests that no Formal Investigation take place.
- Complainants should receive full and complete disclosure of final resolution outcomes.
- There was a lack of specificity regarding when one must notify Title IX as Responsible Employee, and if information received second or third hand must be reported.

Open Access Policy for Theses and Dissertations – second round review
Graduate Council reviewed the revised Open Access Policy for Theses and Dissertations. GC supported the proposal in its first round review and did not have comments; other campuses had more concerns. Members found the proposal still well aligned with current UCSB practice and supported the revisions.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Bylaw 336
Graduate Council discussed the proposed changes to Bylaw 336, concerning Privilege and Tenure procedures. Members endorsed tightening the timeline, and applying these revisions to all disciplinary cases. GC sent forward a memo of endorsement.

UC Center Sacramento – State Assessment Report
Graduate Council discussed the UC Center Sacramento – State Assessment Report. Since the program is almost exclusively focused on undergraduate students, members suggested encouraging the expansion of the graduate program, as long as funding could be found. Members also suggested that the UC Center Sacramento could offer expanded knowledge and professional networks for graduate students working in public policy fields. These comments were sent forward in a memorandum.

Systemwide Review of Proposed New APM 011, Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees
Graduate Council discussed the proposed new APM 011, which would cover academic freedom and protections for non-faculty academic appointees. Overall, members were supportive of the new APM section. However, the impact on graduate students was not well explained. GC sent forward a
memorandum suggesting further clarification about how APM 011 would affect graduate students when they are appointed into one of these non-faculty academic appointments.

**Dignity Health**
Graduate Council discussed, over multiple meetings, the proposed expanded affiliation between UC San Francisco and Dignity Health. There was systemwide debate about whether this affiliation contradicted the mission of UC. Dignity Health, which are Catholic affiliated hospitals, have restrictions on certain types of medical procedures (birth control, abortion, end-of-life care, treatment of LGBTQ individuals). There was also the concern about whether Academic Council should interfere with UCSF autonomy. GC sent Chair Bohn a memorandum voicing its deep concern regarding the ethical implications of an affiliation of this nature. GC was pleased to learn that UC San Francisco decided to not expand their relationship with Dignity Health.

**IX. Committees**
Over the past several years, Graduate Council has opted to handle the vast majority of its business in full Council sessions, rather than delegating issues to the subcommittees. The subcommittees are called to meet only on an ad hoc basis.

**X. Carry Over Issues for 2019-20**
- Faculty graduate student mentorship guidelines.
- Following up on the re-opening of graduate admissions for the Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies.
- Reviewing a revised proposal to establish an Interdisciplinary PhD Emphasis in Climate Science.
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SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THE SELECTION OF A PRESIDENT
March 14, 2013

TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Committee presents the following from its meeting of March 13, 2013

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

LEADERSHIP

The President of the University of California must be a visionary leader with the judgment, creativity, and courage to enhance the quality and reputation of the University as one of the preeminent public research universities in the world. The President represents the University in its role as an international, national, and state exemplar in the education policy arena. The President will inspire public support of the University in its three missions of education, research, and public service, and demonstrate a commitment to excellence, diversity and inclusion, affordability, and accessibility. To provide this leadership, the President must understand and have demonstrated support for outstanding scholarship and possess the highest intellectual capacity; have extraordinary communication skills; exhibit the leadership qualities necessary to instill the highest ethical standards and conduct throughout the University; have the experience and reputation to command the respect of all the University’s constituents; and maintain limitless energy and enthusiasm, courage, and stamina. The new President will have the capacity to lead change; have the ability to listen to those affected and make a decision; and the dexterity to identify a path forward and motivate others to follow. The President will have a vision for where the University is going (e.g., global innovations; application and uses of new and different technologies; social, economic, and health challenges), as well as the ability to be the face of the University and a strong spokesperson who will explain to all Californians why the University is of particular importance to the social, political, and economic vibrancy of the State.

MANAGEMENT

The quality and complexity of the University, a multi-dimensional, public research, land-grant institution which includes ten campuses, five academic medical centers, the management of three distinguished national laboratories, and an agricultural division with operations in all 58 counties in California, requires a President who has the ability to attract and retain an exceptional, dedicated, and ethical management team whose members come from prestigious careers in both the public and private sectors. In a cooperative environment, the President will develop and implement long-range plans and policies and build teams across the University system. The President should have a proven ability and commitment to attract, promote, maintain, and support staff, as demonstrated by leadership of an organization with best practices in recruitment, retention, and financial support for staff professional development. The President needs to exhibit a comprehension of the magnitude and complexity of the University’s financial
environment and be able to utilize the resources available to the University effectively and efficiently. This includes recognizing that UC, and public universities in general, have seen a gradual, but continued and significant reduction in financial support by the state over many years. The President must be innovative in addressing this constraint through private fundraising and creative revenue generation, administrative and educational delivery efficiencies, and many other solutions in order to maintain the mission and excellence of the University of California. The ability to provide an affordable education for students within this overall financial environment is a critical component. To provide management excellence, the President must be able to inspire, mobilize, and consult effectively with the chancellors, faculty, students, staff, and alumni; guide the accurate allocation of authorities and responsibilities between the campuses and the Office of the President; be committed to the University’s tradition of shared governance with the Academic Senate; have respect for the collective bargaining process; and execute timely and full consultation on issues of concern to the Regents while recognizing the appropriate division of authority between the Board of Regents and the administration.

EXPERIENCE

These necessary leadership and management skills will be most effective in a President who has demonstrated an ability to anticipate and direct change, who has experience interacting successfully with both state and federal government, and is able to establish effective relationships with the Governor, the Legislature, federal officials, and all government agencies important to the success of the University, as well as with other public policymakers and California’s business community; who has the ability to increase public and private funding for the University; who has served as an effective representative and speaker in a variety of public settings; who has the ability to communicate effectively with the public and the media, the capacity to inspire all of UC’s internal constituent groups, the political acumen to develop, sustain, and encourage effective working relationships with the Regents, policymakers, the press, and stakeholder groups, including those who may oppose or be critical of administrative actions, and the intellectual stature to command the respect of the faculty.